



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.23

TPI 2022; SP-11(1): 01-03

© 2022 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 01-11-2021

Accepted: 03-12-2021

Nasir Husain

Faculty of Fisheries,
Sher-e-Kashmir University of
Agricultural Sciences and
Technology of Kashmir,
Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir,
India

TH Bhat

Faculty of Fisheries,
Sher-e-Kashmir University of
Agricultural Sciences and
Technology of Kashmir,
Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir,
India

Ashwani Kumar

Faculty of Fisheries,
Sher-e-Kashmir University of
Agricultural Sciences and
Technology of Kashmir,
Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir,
India

Corresponding Author

Nasir Husain

Faculty of Fisheries,
Sher-e-Kashmir University of
Agricultural Sciences and
Technology of Kashmir,
Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir,
India

Price spread, marketing efficiency and constraints in marketing of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) in Srinagar district of Jammu and Kashmir

Nasir Husain, TH Bhat and Ashwani Kumar

Abstract

The present study is based on primary data collected from 100 fishermen, 10 local agents, 10 traders, 10 commission agents/wholesalers and 30 retailers in Srinagar district engaged in marketing of fish. The results of the study revealed that the fish of the area was marketed through three marketing channels

i) Fisher–Consumer.

ii) Fisher–Local agent–Trader–Retailer–Consumer.

iii) Fisher–Local agent–Trader–Wholesaler–Retailer–Consumer.

The study further revealed that among all the three marketing channels identified for fish marketing, the highest percentage of fisher's share was in channel 1st being 97.55 per cent because of the fact that there were no intermediaries involved in this channel. The fisher's share in consumer rupee was 80.51 per cent in channel 2nd while it was lowest 79.16 per cent in case of channel 3rd. It was clear from the results that the absolute advantage of fisher was the highest in channel 1st being Rs. 204.85/kg. As compared to Rs. 190/ kg. In channel 2nd and 3rd. The results also depicted that the marketing efficiency was highest in marketing channel 1st (39.78) while it was lowest in channel 3rd 3.80.

Keywords: marketing margins, marketing cost, price spread, marketing efficiency

Introduction

Fisheries plays an important role in the Indian economy by augmenting food supply, generating employment, raising nutritional levels and earning foreign exchange. The fish production in the country has shown a steep rise during the last four decades. It has increased from 7.52 lakh tones in 1950-51 to all time high of 14.16 million metric tons in 2019-20. The contribution of the fisheries sector to the GVA for 2019-2020 stood at 1.24 percent and 7.28 percent for agricultural GVA. India exported the marine products to the tune of Rs.46662 crores for the same period. This sector has been instrumental in sustaining of over 28 million people in India, especially the marginalized and vulnerable communities, and has promoted meaningful socio-economic development. Realizing the potential, scope and importance of the fisheries sector, Government of India launched a flagship scheme Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana (PMMSY) in 2020 as a part of Atma Nirbhar Bharat Package with an estimated investment of 20050 crores with the aim to enhance fish production to 220 lakh metric tons by 2024-25 at an average annual growth rate of about 9 per cent. The structure of fish marketing has been changing considerably since the days of technological improvements in fishing industry. The rapid paces of technological changes in the production methods have posed challenges to the marketing system. The infrastructure developments have enabled to have fresh fish to more consumers and new markets. The infrastructures include good roads, ordinary truck transport, transport by insulated vans, supply of ice, cold storage at fish market, processing units, etc. In view of this an attempt is made in this paper with the objectives to identify the marketing channels, to identify various components of marketing costs, margins at different levels in the marketing channels, to estimate the price spread and marketing efficiency under these channels, and to identify the constraints in marketing of common carp.

Materials and Methods

For the present study, the Srinagar fish market of Jammu and Kashmir was purposively selected. A total number of 100 fishers were selected from four villages namely Habak, Dhobighat, Telbal and Ishbar (25 from each village) to collect the marketing information, besides 10 local agents, 10 traders, 10 commission agents/wholesalers and 30 retailers dealing

with the fish trade were also selected for detailed investigation. The survey method was used to conduct analysis through personal interview with the help of well-structured, pre-tested interview schedules, specially designed for the study. Marketing efficiency in different channels was computed by using Shepherd's formula.

$$ME = \frac{V}{I} - 1$$

Where

ME = Index of marketing efficiency.

V = Value of the goods sold (consumer price).

I = Total marketing cost.

Results and Discussion

In marketing of fish, fish moved through various marketing channels. These marketing channels comprised of fisherman, local agent, trader, wholesaler, retailer and consumer. The most common marketing channels identified in the study area for fish were:

1. Fisher-Consumer.
2. Fisher-Local agent-Trader-Retailer-Consumer.
3. Fisher-Local agent-Trader-Wholesaler-Retailer-Consumer.

The marketing cost, per kilogram of fish paid by fisher/local agent/trader/wholesaler/retailer is given in Table 1. The table revealed that the highest marketing cost was borne by the retailer being Rs. 7.75/kg followed by fisher (Rs. 5.15/kg), trader (Rs. 4.40/kg), local agent (Rs. 2.95/kg) and wholesaler (Rs.2.50/kg). Out of total marketing cost, retailer spent highest share on overhead charges being Rs. 4.70/kg followed by transportation from fish market to retail sale point (Rs. 2.20/kg). While trader spent the maximum share of Rs.2.40/kg as transportation charges followed by ice cube Rs. 0.90/kg.

Marketing margin in various channels in the marketing of fish is given in Table 2. The table revealed that the highest net sale price received by the fisherman was in channel I being Rs. 204.85/kg. On the other hand, local agent spent Rs. 2.95/kg as a marketing cost and received net margin of Rs.7.50/kg. The trader spent Rs. 4.40/kg as a marketing cost and received net margin of Rs. 6.15/kg. The marketing cost spent by wholesaler was Rs.2.50/kg and received net margin Rs.

4.25/kg. The retailer spent Rs. 7.75/kg as a marketing cost and got net margin of Rs. 17.25/kg in channel II, while it was lowest in channel III being Rs. 14.50/kg only because in this channel more number of intermediaries were involved.

The price spread and fisher's share in different marketing channel of fish are given in Table 3. The table revealed that the price spread in fish marketing was Rs. 5.15, Rs. 46.00 and Rs. 50.00 per kilogram for channel I, channel II and channel III, respectively. It indicated that price spread was higher in channel III, where maximum intermediaries were involved in the marketing of fish and on the other hand, this was lowest in channel I, as in this channel no intermediaries were involved between the fisher and consumer. The table further revealed that among all the three marketing channels identified for fish, the highest percentage of fisher's share was in channel I, i.e., fisher's-consumer being 97.55 per cent because of the fact that there was no any intermediary involved in this channel. The producer's share in consumer's price was 80.51 per cent in channel II, i.e., fisherman-local agent-trader-retailer-consumer whereas it was lowest (79.16%) in case of the channel III in which four intermediaries were involved between the fisherman and consumer namely local agent-trader-wholesaler-retailer. It is clear from these results that the percentage of fisher's share in consumer rupee is inversely related to the number of middlemen involved in the process of marketing.

The marketing efficiency in different marketing channel of fish is given in Table 4. The marketing efficiency has been estimated by examining the price paid by the consumer as well as the cost incurred in the process of marketing. The table revealed that the marketing efficiency was high in marketing channel I (39.78) and it was lowest in channel III being 3.80.

The various constraints faced by the fisher's in marketing of fish are summarized in Table 5. The table revealed that most severe problem, reported by majority of fisher (93.33%) was that the fisher of the study area got low price of their fish. The second most severe problem, reported by 90 per cent fisher was that they did not have the knowledge about market information. The 86.67 per cent fisher reported the problem related to small number of fish buyers. Another problem, reported by 85 per cent fisher was about most of the fisher being depend on market intermediaries. The 80 per cent fisher reported the problem about the transportation facilities.

Table 1: Marketing cost of fish paid by Fisher's/ local agent/trader/wholesaler/retailer

(Rs/Kg)						
S. No.	Particulars	Fisher	Local agent	Trader	Wholesaler	Retailer
1.	Transportation	-	-	2.40	-	2.20
2.	Overhead charge	4.70	-	-	-	4.70
3.	Container	0.45	-	0.45	0.55	0.45
4.	Collection and assembling	-	2.55	-	-	-
5.	Weighing	-	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
6.	Loading and unloading	-	-	0.25	-	-
7.	Ice cubes	-	-	0.90	0.90	-
8.	Storage	-	-	-	0.35	-
	Total	5.15	2.95	4.40	2.50	7.75

Table 2: Marketing margin in the various channels in the marketing of fish

(Rs/Kg)				
S. No.	Particulars	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III
1.	Fisher's price	210.00	190.00	190.00
2.	Marketing cost born by fisher's	5.15	-	-
3.	Net price of fisher's	204.85	190.00	190.00
4.	Marketing cost born by local agent	-	2.95	2.95
5.	Net margin of local agent	-	7.50	7.50
6.	Marketing cost born by trader	-	4.40	4.40
7.	Net margin of trader	-	6.15	6.15
8.	Marketing cost born by wholesaler	-	-	2.50
9.	Net margin of wholesaler	-	-	4.25
10.	Marketing cost born by retailer	-	7.75	7.75
11.	Net margin of retailer	-	17.25	14.50
12.	Retail sale price/consumer's price	210.00	236.00	240.00

Table 3: Price spread and fisher's share in different marketing channels of fish

(Rs/Kg)				
S. No.	Particular	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III
1.	Fisher's price	204.85	190.00	190.00
2.	Consumer price	210.00	236.00	240.00
3.	Price spread	5.15	46.00	50.00
4.	Fisher's share in consumer rupee (%)	97.55	80.51	79.16

Table 4: Marketing efficiency in different channel

Channel	Consumer Price (Rs/Kg) (V)	Marketing Cost (Rs/Kg) (I)	Marketing efficiency (V/I-1)
I	210	5.15	39.78
II	236	46.00	4.13
III	240	50.00	3.80

Table 5: Major marketing constraints faced by the fishers

S. No.	Constraints faced by the fisher's	Percentage of fisher's
1.	Low price of the fish	93.33
2.	Lack of knowledge about market information	90.00
3.	Small number of fish buyers	86.67
4.	Most of the fisher being depend upon market intermediaries	85.00
5.	Lack of transportation facility	80.00

Conclusion

The present study revealed that a large number of intermediaries are involved in the marketing of fish and every new channel of market involves an additional intermediary resulting the lowering down the fisher's share in consumer rupee. In marketing of fish, the fisher's share in consumer's rupee was found to be inversely related to the number of intermediaries involved in the marketing channel.

There is a need to develop organized fish market in the study area and proper marketing facilities especially in regard of post-harvest like processing of fish and cold storage for increasing fisher's share in consumer's rupee.

References

- Acharya SS, Agarwal NL. Agricultural Marketing in India. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1999.
- Husain Nasir, Singh DS, Gupta NK. Impact of Regulation of Markets on Price Spread of Potato: A Case Study in U.P. Ind. Jour. Agril. Mktg, 2000, 15(3).
- Sharma ML, Husain N, Dev Chandra, Khanduri BK. Price Spread in Marketing of Ginger in Dehradun Market in Uttaranchal. Ind. Jour. of Agril. Markt, 2001, 15 (3).
- Sharma ML, Husain Nasir, Dev Chandra, Khanduri BK.

Marketing of Pulses: A Case Study of Smallholder Farms of Tehri Garhwal District of Uttaranchal. Ind. Jour. Agril. Mktg, 2002, 16(3).

- Singh Ashutosh, Rajesh. Role of Various Intermediaries in Fish Marketing-A Study of Fresh water Fish Trade in Uttaranchal. Indian Journal of Agril. Marketing, 2005, 13(2).
- Husain Nasir, Singh AK. Marketing Costs and Margins in Off-Season Vegetable Pea Marketing in Uttaranchal Ind. Jour. of Agril. Mktg, 2005, 19(2).
- Kumar Nirmal, Malik DP, Singh SN, Kumar Dalip. Price Spread, Marketing Channels and Constraints for Inland Fish. Indian Journal of Agril. Marketing, 2005, 13(2).
- Srivastava SC, Singh HP, Sen Chandra, Hatai LD. Marketing Pattern of Fish in Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Agril. Marketing, 2005, 13(2).
- Singh AK, Shukla AN, Husain Nasir. Marketing of Animals and Small Ruminants in Western U.P. Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing, 2011, 25(2).
- Husain Nasir, Balkhi MH, Wani GB, Hussain Tariq. Marketing System and Price Spread of Common Carp (*Cyprinus carpio communis*) in Sinagar District of Kashmir Valley Annals of Agri Bio Research, 2014, 19(1).
- Baba SH, Husain Nasir, Zargar BA, Bhat Ishrat F, Malik Irtiq. Growth of fisheries sector in Jammu & Kashmir. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 2019, 8(4).