



ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; SP-12(8): 193-196
© 2023 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 22-06-2023
Accepted: 26-07-2023

Mandas Banjare

Department of Agri-Business
and Rural Management, College
of Agriculture, India Gandhi
Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

Sanjay Kumar Joshi

Department of Agri-Business
and Rural Management, College
of Agriculture, India Gandhi
Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

Price spread, marketing efficiency and constraints in fish marketing in Raipur district of Chhattisgarh

Mandas Banjare and Sanjay Kumar Joshi

Abstract

The present study is based on primary data collected from 20 fishermen, 16 wholesalers and 30 retailers in Raipur district engaged in marketing of fish. The results of the study revealed that the fish of the area was marketed through three marketing channels 1. Producer–Consumer. 2. Producer–Retailer–Consumer. 3. Producer–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 98.33 percent because of the fact that there were no intermediaries involved in this channel. The fisher's share in consumer rupee was 86.74 percent in channel 2nd while it was lowest 69.52 percent in case of channel 3rd. It was clear from the results that the absolute advantage of fisher was the highest in channel 3rd being Rs. 150/kg. As compared to Rs. 124.5/ kg and Rs. 145/ kg in channel 1st and 2nd. The results also depicted that the marketing efficiency was highest in marketing channel 1st (59.2) while it was lowest in channel 3rd (4.8).

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

Introduction

The Indian economy is highly reliant on the fishing industry. It increases national income, exports, food and nutritional security, and employment creation. The fisheries sector offers a livelihood for more than 2.8 crore primary-level fishers and fish farmers, as well as many more people farther down the fishing value chain. This sector also provides a considerable segment of the economically underprivileged people of the nation with a significant source of income. The export of marine products reached 12.9 lakh metric tons in 2019–20 and was valued at Rs 46662.85 crores. Almost 17% of our country's agricultural exports are fish and fish products. With its 8118 kilometers of coastline, the country has an exclusive economic zone covering 2.02 million square miles. The availability of inland and marine resources demonstrates the sector's potential for significant expansion. For millions of people, fishing and aquaculture remain significant sources of food, nutrition, money, and a way of living. During 2019–20, the Fisheries sector generated export revenue of Rs. 46,662.85 crores. About 280 lakh people receive livelihood support from the sector at the primary level, and about twice as many do so further down the value chain. One of the best solutions to reduce hunger and dietary deficiencies is fish, which is a cheap and abundant source of animal protein. The state of Chhattisgarh is playing a significant role by fostering rural self-employment through fishing, which in turn gives three rural residents access to wholesome food. 2.20 lakh people have the capacity to find work in the fishing industry. Large carp fish group play a prominent role in fishing, which is mostly dependent on culture. The majority of fish produced and caught in India is sold in regional domestic markets. Market conditions differ from one location to another. The majority of fish markets currently lack many infrastructures and are in the development stage. Both physical infrastructure and facilities of the Indian fish market are quite lacking. In the majority of fish markets, cleanliness and hygiene are given very little priority. Perishability, huge quantity, storage, transportation, commodity quality and quantity, poor demand elasticity, and a big price spread are the major barriers to selling fish.

Materials and Methods

For the present study, the Raipur fish market of Chhattisgarh was purposively selected. A total number of 20 fishers were selected from 20 villages namely Dharsiwa, Dharampura, Jora, Mana, Kandul, Abhanpur, Banjari, Gatapar, Parsada, Uparwara, Arang, Chorhadih, Gidhawa, Khapri, Nardaha, Tilda, Sarora, Sankara, Deori and Ganiyari (1 from each village) to collect

Corresponding Author:

Mandas Banjare

Department of Agri-Business
and Rural Management, College
of Agriculture, India Gandhi
Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

the marketing information, besides 16 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 Acharya's approach.

$$MME = \frac{FP}{(MC+MM)}$$

Where

MME = modified measure of marketing efficiency MC = Marketing cost

MM = Marketing margin

FP = Net price received by farmers

The value of goods marketed to the cost was used as the measure of efficiency. The higher the ratio in a channel, the highest is its efficiency.

Results and Discussion

After conducting research on the fish supply chain in Raipur district's market, it was observed that the distribution process involves various intermediaries, including wholesalers, retailers, and icing warehouse agencies. These intermediaries play a crucial role in ensuring the availability of fresh fish in the market and meeting the demand of consumers. However, their involvement also adds to the complexity of the supply chain and may lead to higher prices for end consumers. The most common marketing channels identified in the study area for fish were:

1. Producer–Consumer.
2. Producer–Retailer–Consumer.
3. Producer–Wholesaler–Retailer–Consumer.

The channel - I was the shortest channel found in the marketing of fish. In this channel as we can observed from the Table 1 that there is absence of intermediaries in between producer and ultimate consumer. The cost incurred by the producer was not high as those wholesalers/retailers incurred during the process, instead there is an addition on costs of labour around Rs 210.3 per quintal. The total cost incurred by the producer was Rs 210.3 per quintal and having the highest marketing efficiency of 59.2. The total quantity of fish sold by Fishermen was 3.21 quintals.

Table 2 displays the producer's net price as well as the marketing margins, pricing spread, and marketing effectiveness for channel II. The retailer serves as the sole intermediary between the producer and the customer in this channel, as they acquire products straight from the producer. The producer's portion of the consumer price was 86.74%. The retailer's marketing expenses came to Rs 665.30 per quintal, or 3.98 percent of consumer shares. The different expenses spent in this channel comprised 75 rupees per quintal for loading and unloading, 97.64 rupees for icing, 126 rupees for transportation, 250 rupees for spoiling, and 116.66 rupees for other expenses. Consumers paid Rs 16715.5 per

quintal, which is the price at which the shop sold the product. With a marketing efficiency of 6.5, retailers make a profit of Rs.1550.2 per quintal.

Table 3 displays the results for fishermen. It demonstrates that there are two market intermediaries-wholesaler and retailer-between the producer and the final consumer in channel III. On the sale of their produce, producers or farmers received Rs 15000 per quintal, or 69.52. The wholesaler who had originally bought the product from the farmer then adds some marketing. Cost and market margin were considered before selling the produce to the last customer. In this manner, the seller's marketing expenses came to Rs 21577.6 per quintal.

Finally, on comparing all three-marketing channel it was found that the marketing channel having less no. of intermediaries has greater marketing efficiency, as it was observed in the channel I, II, III has 59.2 & 6.5, 4.8 respectively. The increment in producer's share in consumer's rupee results due to gradual absence of intermediaries in the following marketing channel. The disposal pattern of fish in the channel – I, channel – II and channel – III was found 3.21 quintals, 8.49 quintals and 15.6 quintals respectively.

In contrast with fisherman's the constraints faced by majority of them were found to be lack of cold storage facilities (76.9), Lack of primary Storage facility fish box (74.85), Lack of Proper training (74.3), Lack of quality seed (74), Lack of knowledge about adequate feeding (72.3), Weight loss with time (70.55), Improper management (63.7), Inadequate support from the bank), Problem of theft by local people (58.15), Delay or irregularity in payment (55.5), Selling of fish under market price due to village panchayat (50.3), Dependent on middleman for supply (48.85), Some restriction faced in public Ponds (39.4), Fluctuation in price (31.95), At time of harvesting non availability of labour (31.85).

Table 1: Price spread of fish marketing channel – I

Particular's	Rs/quintal	Percent
Net price received by Producer	12450.00	98.3389
Disposal of fish (q)	3.21	
Cost incurred by the producer		
Labour cost	210.3	1.661098
Sale price of producer/purchase price of consumer	12660.30	100
Marketing Efficiency	59.2	

Table 2: Price spread of fish marketing channel – II

Particular's	Rs/quintal	Percent
Net price received by Producer/purchased by retailer	14500.00	86.74583
Total quantity sold (q)	8.49	
Cost incurred by the retailer		
1. Loading and unloading	75.00	0.448685
2. Icing	97.64	0.584129
3. Transportation charge	126.00	0.753791
4. Spoilage	250.00	1.495618
5. Other	116.66	0.697915
Sub total	665.30	3.980138
Net margin of retailer	1550.2	9.274027
Sale price of retailer/purchase price of consumer	16715.5	100
Marketing Efficiency	6.5	

Table 3: Price spread of fish marketing channel – III

Particular's	Rs/quintal	Percent
Net price received by producer/Purchased by wholesaler	15000.00	69.52
Total quantity sold (q)	15.6	
1. Loading and unloading	78.64	0.36
2. Icing	113.42	0.53
3. Transportation charge	135.46	0.63
4. Commission charge	520.5	2.41
5. Spoilage	440.00	2.04
6. Other	160.00	0.74
Sub-total (1 to 6)	1448.02	6.71
Net margin of Wholesaler	2060.46	9.55
Sale price of wholesaler/purchase price of retailer	18508.48	85.78
1. Loading and unloading	88.56	0.41
2. Icing	97.63	0.45
3. Transportation charge	115.31	0.53
4. Spoilage	530.36	2.46
5. Other	256.44	1.19
Sub-total (1 to 5)	1088.30	5.04
Net margin of retailer	1980.83	9.18
Sale price of retailer/purchase price of consumer	21577.6	100.00
Marketing Efficiency	4.8	

Table 4: Constraints faced by fishermen's during production and marketing of fish

S. No.	Particulars	Fish farmer's
		Mean value
1	Lack of cold storage facilities	76.9
2	Lack of primary storage facility fish box	74.85
3	Lack of Proper training	74.3
4	Lack of quality seed	74
5	Lack of knowledge about adequate feeding	72.3
6	Weight loss with time	70.55
7	Improper management	63.7
8	Inadequate support from the bank officials	60.1
9	Problem of theft by local people	58.15
10	Delay or irregularity in payment	55.5
11	Selling of fish under market price due to village panchayat	50.3
12	Dependent on middleman for supply	48.85
13	Some restriction faced in public ponds	39.4
14	Fluctuation in price	31.95
15	At time of harvesting non-availability of labour	31.85

Conclusion

The results of the current study showed that a significant number of middlemen are involved in the marketing of fish, and that each new route of distribution adds another middleman, diminishing the share of the fisher in consumer rupee. It was discovered that the percentage of the fisher in the consumer's rupee was inversely related to the quantity of middlemen present in the marketing channel. The study area needs to establish a well-organized fish market and appropriate marketing infrastructure, particularly with regard to post-harvest activities like fish processing and cold storage that will increase the participation of fishers in consumer rupee.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- Bhaskar SK, Gauraha AK, Joshi S, Kumar S, Ayush, Choudhary VK. An economic analysis of processing and marketing of spices in Mungeli district of Chhattisgarh. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2021;10:817-821.
- Parmar G, Leua A, Vanza J. Study on Fish Marketing Channel and Consumption Pattern for Fish in Navsari, An International Refereed, Peer Reviewed & Indexed Quarterly Journal in Science, Agriculture & Engineering. 2018;8:74-76. ISSN: 2277- 7601.
- Sayeed A, Islam MS, Ahamad MH. Fish Marketing Channel Analysis of Mohipur Bandor in Bangladesh, *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 2019, 4, ISSN 2456 – 2165
- Shobiya P, Uventhikka S, Sivagini K, Amarathunga AMHD, Gobykrishanth R, Fernando ASR, et al., Marketing Channels and Intermediaries in Gurunagar Fish Market, Jaffna, Sri Lanka, 9th Annual Science Research Sessions-2020; c2020.
- Mopidevi R, Devi SK. Primary Fish Market Conditions: An Analysis on Role of Middlemen (Nizampatnam Port-Bay of Bengal). *International Journal of Medical Research and Review*. 2015;5(3):151-158.
- Raj BMU, Teggi MY, Mukartal SY. A study on price spread and marketing efficiency of inland fish marketing in Northern dry zone of Karnataka, *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2022;SP-11(4):986-990.
- Suleiman A, Fregene Tosan. Analysis of Costs and Returns of Artisanal Fish Marketing in Kebbi State,

- Nigeria, Journal of Rural Economics and Development, 2020, 20(1).
8. Nisar U, Kumar NR, Kumar DK, Gawa S, Anamika S. Profitability, Investment Pattern and Constraints of Major Marketing Intermediaries Involved in Supply Chain of Exotic Carps in Jammu and Kashmir, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science, ISSN:2319 – 7706. 2018;7(2):3130-3143.47
 9. Pongener B, Sharma A. Constraints Faced by the Fishery Enterprises: A SWOC Analysis, International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7(5):1595-1603.
 10. Husain Nasir, Bhat TH, Kumar A. Price spread, marketing efficiency and constraints in marketing of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) in Srinagar district of Jammu and Kashmir, The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;SP-11(1):01-03.
 11. Rahaman SM, Bera BK, Ananth GS.). A study on problems and constraints in production and marketing of fish in West Bengal, Journal of Crop and Weed. 2013;9(1):110-113.