

Analysis on Marketing of Inland Fish (*Catla catla*)

Kanikelli Priyanadh^{1*} and Sanjay Kumar²

¹Author, M.Sc. Agricultural Economics

²Assistant Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Economics
SHUATS, Prayagraj-211007

*Corresponding Author E-mail: priyanath.k77@gmail.com

Received: 15.12.2020 | Revised: 21.01.2021 | Accepted: 27.01.2021

ABSTRACT

The study is an analysis of price spread, producer's share in consumer's rupee and marketing efficiency of Catla catla in West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh. A multistage sampling technique was employed to select the market functionaries from whom information were collected using structural questionnaires from the different marketing channels. This study reveals the total marketing cost and marketing margins of the market intermediaries involved in various stages. Then the collected data has been tabulated and analyzed with the help of statistical tools.

Keywords: *Catla catla, Price spread, Producer's share, Marketing efficiency.*

INTRODUCTION

Catla catla has been one of the most produced fish across the country which is grown extensively alongside Rohu, Silver carp and other native fishes. Consumption of fish might be low in India compare to FAO reports that is 20.4 kg per capita in India it is recorded up to 6.6 kg per capita. Setting this aside India is one of the leading exporters of fish production in India registered massive growth in the past six decades with 13.7 million metric tons in 2018 - 2019. India stands third in fisheries and second in aquaculture industry across the world. India aims to grab and sustain the proportionate share in global market as it contributes 6.3 % of global fish related production.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study has been conducted in Eluru block of West Godavari located in between latitude 16.9174⁰ North, 81.33990 East. West Godavari District is well developed in Fisheries with Resources of Fishery wealth in Marine, Brackish Water, Reservoir and Inland Fisheries. It is in fact the aqua hub of Andhra Pradesh. Blue Revolution is well expressed in this district through a multi-pronged approach which includes the introduction of fast-growing, high-yielding species Multi stage random sampling was used for the study to select the respondents, 98 respondents has been selected from four different villages randomly based on the population of the villages.

Cite this article: Priyanadh, K., & Kumar, S. (2021). Analysis on Marketing of Inland Fish (*Catla catla*), *Ind. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 9(1), 354-358. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-2845.8547>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**Table 1: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and Price Spread in different Size of Farm Groups (Rs/qtls)
Channel 1**

Channel 1		
Producer → Consumer		
Sno	Particulars	catla catla
	Sale price of producer	12168
	Cost incurred by producer	
	Packing cost	105
	Weighing cost	86
	Miscellaneous	96
	Total cost	287
	Net price received by producer	12112
	Consumer paid price	12168
	Marketing efficiency	42.39

The above table reveals the marketing channel 1, in which there are no intermediaries involved .it shows total marketing cost incurred for a producer which involves

packing, weighing of the fish which is Rs 287/quintal in fingerling size and marketing efficiency recorded 42.39 in a fingerling size of *catla catla* respectively.

**Table 2: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and Price Spread in different Size of Farm Groups (Rs/qtls)
Channel 2**

Channel 2			
Producer → Auctioneer → Wholesaler → Retailer → Consumer			
Sno	Particular	Rs/qtls	
1	Sale price of producer	12362	
	auctioneer commission	250	
	total marketing cost	250	
	producers selling price	12362	
	net price received by producer	12112	
2	Cost incurred by wholesaler		
	Wholesalers buying price	12232	
	Auctioneers commission	250	
	Transportation	80	
	Wages(loading & unloading)	73	
	market tolls	35	
	Miscellaneous	56	
	Wholesaler's marketing cost	494	
	Wholesaler's marketing margin	150	
	Wholesaler's selling price	12876	
3	Cost incurred by retailer		
	Retailers paid price	12876	
	Wages(loading & unloading)	70	
	marketing tolls	38	
	Miscellaneous	51	
	storing and icing	60	
	Containers	73	
	Transportation	61	
	Cleaning	50	
	Retailer's marketing cost	403	
	Retailer's marketing margin	233	
	Retailer's selling price	13512	
	4	total marketing cost	1147
Total marketing margin		383	
5	Consumer's paid price	13512	
6	Price spread	1530	
7	Marketing efficiency	8.83	
8			

Above table reveals the marketing cost, price spread and marketing margin of channel 2, three intermediaries were identified in this marketing channel. Producer sells his produce to wholesaler through auctioneer .producer finds targeted wholesalers and auctions the produce to wholesaler and in turn sells it to the retailers in the market. Finally the produce reaches customer after collecting commissions. Marketing cost when producers sold the produce is Rs.250/quintal which is auctioneers commission. The purchased produce is transported in containers and

supplied to retailers by wholesaler at various levels which costs about an average of Rs. 494/qtls in fingerling, after adding margin to it i.e. Rs 150/quintal .similarly retailers marketing cost and marketing margin i.e.Rs.403/quintal and Rs.233/quintal respectively. In total the average total marketing cost from the collected samples 1147/quintal, marketing margin is recorded as Rs.383/quintal. Price spread is recorded as Rs.1530/quintal. Marketing efficiency is calculated at 8.83.

Table 3: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and Price Spread in different Size of Farm Groups (Rs/qtls)
(table no.4.11)

Channel 3		
Producer → Auctioneer → Trader → Wholesaler → Retailer → Consumer		
S.no	Particular	Cost per quintal
1	Sale price of producer	12362
	auctioneer commission	250
	total marketing cost	250
	producers selling price	12362
	net price received by producer	12112
2	Cost incurred by trader	
	Traders buying price	12362
	auctioneer's commission	250
	Transportation	110
	wages (loading & unloading)	31
	market tolls	39
	Miscellaneous	71
	Containers	54
	total marketing cost of trader	555
marketing margin of trader	312	
Traders selling price	13229	
3	Cost incurred by wholesaler	
	Wholesalers buying price	13229
	Transportation	80
	wages (loading & unloading)	73
	market tolls	35
	Miscellaneous	60
	wholesalers marketing cost	248
	wholesalers marketing margin	150
4	Wholesalers selling price	13627
	Cost incurred by retailer	
5	Retailers buying price	13627
	wages (loading & unloading)	70
	marketing tolls	38
	Miscellaneous	51
	storing and icing	40
	Containers	45
	Transportation	41
	Cleaning	50
	retailers marketing cost	335
	retailers margin	152
6	Retailers selling price	14114
6	Customers buying price	14114
	total marketing cost	1388
	total marketing margin	614
	price spread	2002
	Marketing efficiency	6.84

Above table reveals the marketing cost, price spread and marketing margin of channel 3, four intermediaries were identified in this marketing channel. Producer sells his produce to trader through auctioneer .producer finds targeted traders and auctions the produce to traders and in turn sells it to the traders in the market. The traders buy the produce from farmer and transports to various markets to distribute among wholesalers adding his marketing cost and marketing margin i.e. 555/quintal and 312/quintal. Then wholesalers distribute the produce to local retailers with certain margin. Finally the produce reaches customer after collecting commissions.

Marketing cost when producers sold the produce is Rs.250/quintal which is auctioneers commission. The purchased produce is transported in containers and supplied to retailers by wholesaler at various levels which costs about an average of Rs.248/quintal, after adding margin to it i.e. Rs 150/quintal. similarly retailers marketing cost and marketing margin i.e. Rs. 335/quintal and Rs.152/quintal. In total the average total marketing cost from the collected samples are 1388 fingerling, marketing margin is recorded as Rs.614/quintal. Price spread is recorded as Rs.2002/quintal. Marketing efficiency is calculated at 6.84.

Table 4: Comparison of total marketing cost, total marketing margin, price spread, producer's share in consumer rupee (%) and marketing efficiency in three different channels (fingerling) (Rs/qtls).

S.no	Particulars	Channel-I	Channel-II	Channel-III
1	Total marketing cost	287	1147	1388
2	Total marketing margin	0	383	614
3	Price spread	287	1530	2002
4	Producer share in consumer rupee (%)	97.68	89.63	85.81
5	Marketing efficiency	43.2	8.83	6.84

Table 4 reveal that total marketing cost in channel-I was Rs.287/quintal, price spread Rs.287/quintal, producer share in consumer rupee 97.68, marketing efficiency 43.2 percentage and there is no total marketing margin respectively.

The total marketing cost in channel-II was Rs.1147/quintal, total marketing margin Rs.383/quintal; price spread Rs.1530/quintal, producer share in consumer rupee 89.63 percent and marketing efficiency 8.83 percentage.

The total marketing cost in channel-III was Rs.1388/quintal, followed by total marketing margin Rs.614/quintal, price spread Rs.2002/quintal, producer share in consumer rupee 88.36 and marketing efficiency 6.84 percentage.

Producers share in consumers rupee is recorded highest in channel I with 97.68 percent, followed by channel II with 90.97 percent and channel III with 88.36 percent as there are more market intermediaries involved in channel II and channel III.

Table 5: ANOVAs for Comparison of total marketing cost, total marketing margin, price spread, producer's share in consumer's rupee (%) and marketing efficiency in three different channels.

ANOVA								
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	F crit	result	sed	cd
Rows	2461054.232	3	820351.4106	5.839325421	4.757062664	s	265	648.431
Columns	1485813.408	2	742906.7041	5.288067951	5.14325285	s	306	748.755
Error	842924.158	6	140487.3597					
Total	4789791.798	11						

In the above ANOVA table, due to size group degrees of freedom is 2, sum of squares is

1485813, mean sum of squares is 742906, F. Calculated value is 5.28, F. tabulated value @

5% is 5.14, result is not significant, standard deviation is 306 and critical difference is @ 5% is 748.755. In due to particulars, degrees of freedom is 3, sum of squares is 2461054, mean sum of squares is 820351, F. Calculated value 5.83, F. tabulated value @ 5% is 4.75, result is significant, standard deviation is 265 and critical difference is 648.4316. In error, degree of freedom is 6, sum of squares is 842924 and mean sum of squares is 140487.35.

CONCLUSION

The present study reveals that the large farmers practicing fisheries tend to gain more profit when compared to medium and small farmers. There are about four middle men involved in the process of marketing of inland fish (*Catla catla*) i.e. Auctioneer, Trader, Wholesaler, Retailer. The study reveals three existing marketing channel i.e. channel I (Producer to Consumer), channel II (Producer -Auctioneer - Wholesaler - Retailer - Consumer), channel III (Producer- Auctioneer – Trader - Wholesaler – Retailer - Consumer). The producer's share in consumer's rupee happens to higher in channel I followed by channel II and channel III because of no

market intermediaries present in the particular channel.

REFERENCES

- Banafar, Singh & Gauraha, A. K. (2007). Economics of production and marketing of duck –cum-fish enterprises: a micro level evidence from Chhattisgarh, *Agricultural Marketing*. 50(3), 17-20pp.
- Bhattacharya, H. (2002). Commercial exploitation of fisheries: production, marketing and finance strategies. (19), 327pp.
- Kingra & Singh (2007). Examination on fresh water fish marketing and price spread. Published. Punjab.
- Ravishankar, C. N. (July 2018). Economics of Indian fisheries. Published, KAU, Kochi.
- Singh, A. K. (1996). An economic analysis of production and marketing of fish in Nagra block of Ballia District, U.P. Unpublished, M.Sc Agricultural Economics thesis, Allahabad agriculture institute. Deemed University.