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#### Abstract

A survey was conducted on Gaibandha Sadar fish marketing system in some selected areas to determine the socio-economic profile, marketing channels of fish trading, marketing margins, consumer price share by fish farmer and other intermediaries and factors that affect marketing margin of the fish traders, therefore, identify the problems and suggestions for its improvement. The research was carried out at Gaibandha town's several markets from October 2020 to February 2021. A total of 120 fish dealers (Fish Farmer, Bepari, Aratdar, and Retailers) equally from three markets were selected through purposive sampling. A significant number of people in Gaibandha district engaged as beparis, aratdars, and retailers in the fish trading sector. The farmer traded fish to bepari. The fish was subsequently sold to the retailer via aratdar. Retailers served as the final link in the fish marketing chain, interacting directly with customers. In the study region, for aratdar, the entire expense of fish was found to be Tk. 154.96, TK. 438.96 fish farmer, Tk. 646.96 for Bepari, and retailer, Tk. 228.46 per quintal of fish. Among them, Beparis value-added cost is the highest as a result of higher aratdar commission and transportation charges, although Aratdar has the lowest value-added cost. Bepari average net profit was Tk. 3436 and Aratdar's' average net profit was Tk.221.54 and the Retailers' average net profit was Tk.3851.54. It was observed that market Channel - II is the longest route than channel-I and channel-III. On aggregate, fish farmers obtain $49.3 \%$ of the price paid by consumers, implying that intermediaries gain $51 \%$ of the consumer price. Among 13 variables included in the multiple regression model, transportation, loading and unloading, icing, electricity, personal expense wage, wastages, sale \& cost price, other expense are found significantly affecting the marketing margin of fish traders. Traders and customers faced a lot of problems. The upgrading of fish transport facilities, the accessibility of loans, and the implementation of fish quality control procedures, awareness about fish marketing system is proposed in order to enhance the fish marketing system and uplift the socioeconomic condition of stakeholders in the study areas.
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## TERMINOLOGY

Arat: An Aratdar's office, store, or warehouse in a bazaar where he does his business.

Aratdar: The most effective player in the fish supply system. On a commission basis, an Aratdar organizes or negotiates sales for the vendors. He frequently works as a wholesaler. He is also a major source of credit for fishermen as well as traders.

Paiker/Bepari: Paikers are middlemen in the fish marketing chain who often cover the assembly function while also working as Dadandar; depending on the region, they are also known as distributors and retailers. They're also known as Bepari.

Farias: Farias are fish market brokers that buy tiny quantities of fish from fishermen far away from the market, transport it to the terminal point, and sell it to an Aratdar or retailer.

Dadan: This is a type of loan given to fishermen by Aratdars and mohajans (traditional money lenders) on the condition that they must sell their fish to them. Rates are sometimes set in fixed.

Koyals: Koyals are those who handle the auction for the Aratdars. They arrange the auction by offering the assembled bidders the lot's initial price. The bids offered by the purchasers are then announced loudly in front of the auction participants. They continue the loop until the exact price

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

The agriculture sector stands at the Centre of the Country's economic growth, accounting for $39 \%$ of the total employment in the country, in the FY2020-21 budget, the development expenditure of BDT 118.68 billion earmarked towards agriculture marks a $4.59 \%$ growth since FY2019-20 (ILO, 2021). The Bangladesh economy is dominated by agriculture sector contributing $13.47 \%$ to the (GDP) Gross Domestic Product (BBS, 2020). Among agricultural products, the fishing sector accounts for $3.61 \%$ of GDP and $24.41 \%$ of agricultural GDP (BBS, 2018). In Bangladesh, total inland fishing supply water region is roughly 5.3 million hectares, with $92.27 \%$ inland open waters and only 7.73 \% confined water bodies (DoF, 2019). Fishery are secondlargest foreign exchange earner, after only garment exports in our country. The most important products are Hilsa, dry, salted, and dehydrated fish, live fish, and crab, as well as a small quantity of value-added fish and shrimp supplies. Bangladesh's frozen fish and shrimp exports make for about 5\% of the country's total export revenues (DoF, 2019). Bangladeshi shrimp is mainly imported by the EU Countries, the Americas, and Japan, taking account for more than $95 \%$ of Bangladesh's cumulative fishery export earnings (DoF, 2019). Southeast Asia and the Middle East make up the rest of the region. Exporting fish and fish products added $3.52 \%$ to national GDP, $26.37 \%$ to agricultural GDP, and $1.39 \%$ to international trade in 2017-18. (BBS, 2019). Fish probably accounts for $60 \%$ of total domestic animal protein intake. In Bangladesh, fish has become one of the key commodities for food security in recent days. Besides other agricultural products, the country's food sector is seeing an increase in demand for fish. As a consequence, it is essential to investigate the possibilities of the fish market and efficiently and successfully suggest marketing and supply network concepts on this. The analysis of marketing tactics, particularly value - adding analysis, offers the series of activities required to bring a product from idea to primary product delivery to end user. (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2000). Marketing mechanisms play a crucial role in escalating demand and supply, as well as in triggering the stage of economic progress.

The nation generated over 4.503 million ( 45.03 lakh) tons of fish in fiscal year 201920, a little than last decade's start figuring of 4.503 million (45.03 lakh). (DoF, 2020) Bangladesh obtains self-sufficiency. The following table shows the fish production over last four years:

Table 1.1: Fish production over last four years in Bangladesh

| Year | Production in terms of sources (MT) |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inland water | Closed water |  |  |
| $2019-2020$ | 1248401 | 2583866 | 671104 | 4503371 |
| $2018-2919$ | 1235709 | 2488601 | 659911 | 4384221 |
| $2017-2018$ | 1216539 | 2405415 | 654687 | 4276614 |
| $2016-2017$ | 1163606 | 2333352 | 637476 | 4134434 |

Source: Department of Fisheries (2020)

### 1.2 Justification of the Study

The economy of Bangladesh is largely depend on agriculture and fisheries is one of the prime sub-sector of it where about 15.81 million people engaged in this sector for their livelihood. (BBS, 2019). Therefore, research work need to be taken on management of fish marketing system. Literature suggest few research on marketing system of fish and socioeconomic profile of fish traders (Barman, 2014; Zafar, 2015), several research conducted on profitability of fish farming all over the country (Roy, 2010). But combination of net profit and the factors that affects to the net margin as well as consumer price share by stakeholders at the end level was done in a few numbers. Therefore, this study work on the estimation of marketing margin and factors influencing marketing margin of fish in Gaibandha Sadar. This study also provides the information of problems faced by farmers and possible solutions for listed problems of fish trading that can be a catalyst to develop the fish market in the study area and a valuable source of information to the literature.

### 1.3 Objectives of the study

In the context stated above, the intention of this survey was to find out a little more about the following objectives:
a. To identify the socioeconomic profile of the fish traders;
b. To assess the emerging fish marketing system;
c. To examine the factors that affect marketing margin of the fish traders.

### 1.4 A Study Outline

This thesis includes six chapters or sections. Chapter I discusses the introduction including the background, domestic production, justification and objectives of the study. Later, a review of related literature is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III explains the research methodology of the study. The results and the discussion of the study are revealed in Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII Finally, Chapter VIII. Shows the summary, conclusions and policy recommendations of the study.

## CHAPTER 2 <br> REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 2.1Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the available studies related to present research. In any research review of literature is essential; because it provides a scope for reviewing the stock of knowledge and information relevant to the proposed research. In spite of the necessity of studies on the marketing of fishes, some empirical studies have so far been conducted in Bangladesh. Here is given below a summary of few key research conducted both within and outside in Bangladesh.

### 2.2 Literature review on Fish marketing system

Achaijee (2006) conducted research on the socioeconomic characteristics of fishermen, examined the current open water fish marketing system, evaluated marketing costs and margins of intermediaries at different market levels in the system, and estimated the seasonal price fluctuation of different species of fish.

Siddique (2008) found that in Mymensigh district, fishermen utilize boats, pushcarts, rickshaws, and vans to transport their catch, while middlemen use trains, rikshaws, and pushcarts.

Biswas (2009) found that Producers used boats/mechanical boats, shoulder load, head load, rickshaw and van to transport fish and dried fish, while intermediaries in Cox's Bazar and Chittagong districts employed truck, van, rickshaw, head load, shoulder load. Hasan and Middendrop (2013) investigated two fish markets in south-west Bangladesh and observed that the price per kg of carp increased with size for both Indian major and exotic carps. Rohu was determined to be the most costly of the six carp species studied, followed by catla, mrigal, grass carp, common carp, and silver carp.

Yousuf (2014) conducted a study on the condition of fish selling in Jamalpur, the social and economic aspects of fish producers and marketing systems in Jamalpur district was its focus of this study. It was found that the price of fish is affected by market structure, species, quality, size, and weight. The price per kilogram of carp goes up with the size and freshness of the fish.

Sabur (2014) noted that an efficient marketing system is essential for earning fair profit for the fish farmers and traders. Marketing functions may be defined as major specialized activities performed in accomplishing the marketing process of concentration, equalization and dispersion.

Majid (2015) carried out a research in selected parts of the Mymensigh district, on pond fish marketing. The present marketing structure, as well as the expenses and margins of market intermediaries, were calculated in that research. In that investigation, five different types of marketing channels were discovered.

Sabur (2005) studied on the marketing of marine seafood. The research analysed the current fish selling system in Chittagong town and Cox's Bazar, as well as the costs and margins at various functional levels. He also looked for ways of making the current marketing systems better.

Muir et al. (2007) noted that consumer expectations, global competitiveness, health and quality product features have taken on considerably higher significance in many aquaculture industries than they did in the early phases while output levels were lower.

Mia (2003) found that in Mymensigh district, three marketing chains are available: fish farmer-bapary-aratder-retailer-consumer, fish farmer-bapery-retailer-consurner, and bapary-aratder-retailer-consumer.

Ahmed (2014) studied the marketing margins of representative intermediaries' action between inland producers on the one hand and Dhaka and Pabna consumers on the other. The fish species considered were hilsa, rohu, and shing. It was observed that producers received between $50 \%$ and $65 \%$ of the selling price in all cases. The assembler and distributor received the majority of the marketing profit, whereas retail margins were just $5-10 \%$ of the consumer.

Khalil (2002) stated that fishermen and intermediaries in the Cox's Bazar and Chittagong districts faced a variety of issues, including a lack of fishing equipment, ice, and capital, as well as higher gear tolls, a defective weighing system, low fish prices, a lack of marketing facilities, price fluctuation, and political instability.

Cui (1995) mentioned that China's fisheries sector still requires guidance to help, particularly in the areas listed below: 1) the renovation of wholesale fish markets;
2) the establishment of a nationwide fish marketing information system; 3) the implementation of fish marketing rules and regulations, the uniformity of marketing activities, and the improving of market management and operations skills; and 4) personnel training in fish market operations and management.

Chimbuya and Mutsekwa (1993) stated that trucks transport consignments from kabob to major metropolitan markets in Zimbabwe are primarily responsible for fish distribution. Fish are delivered by public bus or private motor trucks from smaller waterbodies, however local settlements are served by bicycle-mounted vendors.

Sadanandan et al. (2006) noted that consumer acceptability and market price levels are two of the most important elements that influence economic sustainability in many circumstances.

Katiha and Chandra (2012) found that in Allahabad, the existing fish market system was fairly integrated in terms of inter-market price fluctuations and higher retailer profit margins, account for a large percentage of the price paid by customers, indicating inefficiency.

Olukosi et al (2007) making fish available to consumers at reasonable prices at right time and place in fresh condition requires an effective marketing system.

Rokeya et al (2002) in Rajshahi markets, five kinds of men were found to be involved in the supply chain from producer to customer. Local agents (dalal) collect and purchase fish on commission. Mahajans then bring the catch to the local market and sell it to local shopkeepers, wholesalers (paikers), and distributors (Bapery) via commission agents (Aratdar). The primary packaging materials utilized to transport the fish were wooden boxes, bamboo baskets, earthen pots, aluminum cans, drums, and so on. As an alternate packing material, banana leaves and aquatic weeds were commonly used. In Rajshahi, fish transportation methods include boat, head load, shoulder load, pull cart, rickshaw, and motor vehicle, as well as trains, buses, and trucks.

Wohlgenant (2001) reviewed the studies on marketing margins and the development of empirical models. Aside from the variables that come in when using a structural model
that looks at the farm, retail, and input market equilibria, he also discussed other possible explanatory variables that had been included in studies that used reduced-form models instead of a complete structural model.

Quddus and Rahman (2000) claimed that numerous methods of transporting fish were studied, and truck transport seemed to be the most acceptable. He observed that increased fish supply through better organization and investment in sufficient trucks will lower the cost and maintain the quality of fish in the marketplaces of the major towns and their surrounding areas.

Hoshen (2013) mentioned that in Bangladesh, around 97 percent of production is marketed internally for domestic use, while just 3 percent of trading is exported. Marketing organizations, fish freezing and storage facilities, and ice factories should all be enhanced for proper marketing systems. Furthermore, he advised that fish quality control, the role of cooperatives, financing availability, and women's participation in fish marketing be ensured.

Zaman and Jeweland (2006) did a study on the marketing system and the price behavior of pond fish in some selected existing marketing systems, as well as estimated marketing expenses and margins for intermediaries According to the study's findings, the costs of Aratdar, Paiker, and Retailer were BDT 12.45, 62.32 , and $26.22 / 100 \mathrm{~kg}$, respectively. The net marketing margin or profit for aratdar, paiker, and retailer was calculated to be BDT 157.04, 204.21, and $724.49 / 100 \mathrm{~kg}$ of fish, respectively. The seasonal price change of sampled fish was not noticeable. It was similar in the case of rohu and catla fish.

Ahmed (2008) observed several sorts of organizations/intermediaries participating in various stages of fish marketing in India. Costs, commissions, structure, risk, and profitability of different members, price spread, and the function of cooperatives and state fisheries development enterprises in the marketing system are all taken into account.

Ranadhir (2001) six major markets in Lagos, Nigeria, were researched. According to analysis, traders obtain the majority of their first financing via trade groups. Most traders rely on working capital to maintain a consistent network of outlets, therefore
wholesalers seek cash from associations, while retailers seek funds from wholesalers. They eventually make up for it when they sell to customers.

Agarwal (1990) suggested that the goal of fish marketing should not be to capture and sell fish, but rather to have a broad scope for exploitation, production, distribution, preservation, and transportation of fish in addition to the actual sale of fish by minimizing intermediaries.

Atapattu (2007) mentioned that Sri Lanka's fish marketing and distribution system is cantered with cooperative aspects. Cooperatives created specifically for the purpose of fish marketing may not only help to improve fish distribution, but also help to provide more equal earnings for fishermen.

Dewan (2000) carried out a research on the selling of freshwater fish in the town of Mymensingh. He evaluated the structural and organizational aspects of the fish marketing industry and observed that concentration was higher at the Aratdar level. He also stated that the marketing channels included Nikeris (carriers), auctioneers, dispatchers'chalanis, Aratdars, and retailers.

Sarker (1999) extensively worked on the selling of cultured fish in a few areas of Chandpur district. He looked at the marketing channels, expenses, margins, and pricing spreads, as well as marketing issues, and made several recommendations for improving the fish marketing system.

Srivastava and Ranadhir (2005) found that in Bhubaneshwar, Orrisa, India, $t$ the fish prices were highest in the case of the longest marketing channel since it included a high marketing cost in comparison to gross margin.

Rahman (2003) found that in Gazipur marketing of fish was almost exclusively a preserve of the private sector where the livelihoods of a large number of people were linked with fish distribution and marketing system.

## Research Gap:

After reviewing several literatures, a conclusion can be drawn that most of the studies conducted on socio-economic profile, cost and return, profitability and marketing system of fish. In most of the cases, the studies were done on marketing system of fish on a particular area. There are few studies conducted on identifying and estimating the influential effect of various factors on marketing margin of fish. Moreover, there is a limited study was conducted in the study area on fisheries sector regardless of economic importance of fisheries in this area.

## CHAPTER 3

## METHODOLOGY

Methodology is the organized activity which entails gathering data from a predetermined region and respondents in accordance with the study's objectives. Methodology is the groundwork and therefore most essential component of any research inquiry. Used of appropriate methodology and steps shows the reliability of any scientific research. (Alam,2003) This chapter includes with step by step procedures, different methods, statistical tools and techniques in a logical manner. The researchers has a precise knowledge in following scientific and logical methods. It provides detailed information about study analysis, description of study area and characteristics of respondents related with the objectives. This chapter includes; selection of study area and its description, selection of respondents, sampling technique, process for data grouping, analytical techniques and statistical tools.

### 3.1 Selection of the Study Region

The study area is a crucial phase in any research project since it establishes a base from which required data may be collected in accordance with the goals. Gaibandha is a north district located with vast water bodies in form of ponds, canals, floodplains, rivers and so on. Major rivers are Tista, Bromaputra, kartoaand Ghaghot.Fish farming become more widespread. As a result, significance number of people engaged with fish farming and trading business. The major reasons for selecting the study area were as follows:
i. Availability of commercial fish farming in the study area.
ii. Easy communication \& cooperation from the respondents.
iii. Previously few studies were conducted in this location.


Figure 3.1: Geographical location of Gaibandha Sadar

### 3.2 Technique of Sampling and Data Collection Procedure

Sampling is a vital feature of field survey. Due to time and resource barriers, it was not possible to engage all of the stakeholders in the study region. Both fish farmers and aggregators are entailed. Bepari, Aratdars and Retailers were selected purposively. The author had collected all the data from three three fish markets named Puraton Bazar, Notun Bazar, and Howkers market for its significance. A total of 120 fish dealers (Fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar, and retailers) were equally from three markets were selected through purposive sampling.

Table 3.1: Number of samples picked on specific purpose from the three fish market-

| Study Area | Fish intermediaries | Sample size |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Puraton Bazar | Fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar, retailer | 40 |
| Notun Bazar | Fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar, retailer | 40 |
| Howkers market | Fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar, retailer | 40 |

### 3.3 Questionnaire Preparation

The accomplishment of a survey is entirely reliant on the appropriate organized of the questionnaire plan. The pretesting interview was taken with a preliminary structured questionnaire for collecting data. A few fish farmers and traders were randomly pretested. After pretesting, some modification and changes were done in the questionnaire. Some of the readjustments also happened on the basis of observation on fish local market in the study area.

### 3.4 Data

Data were managed to gather according to the questionnaire, face-to-face meeting and secondary data were collected from different sources of published journals, articles and reports.

### 3.4.1 Primary data

Initial data were obtained via individual interviews of chosen respondents and through structure questionnaire survey. Socio-economic data, quantity of fish production, loan accessibility or not, costing, profits, different prices from different intermediaries in the market, market supply and demands, market information, processing, marketing channel, marketing costs and margins were collected.

### 3.4.2 Secondary data

Secondary data were also used in this study from different sources as articles, journal and reports. The sources of secondary data were- BBS, BFRI, DAE, WB and FAO.

### 3.5 Period of Data Collection

Primary data were collected from Gaibandha Sadar in October-December, 2020. Secondary data were managed to gather from multiple sources during the documentation assignment. Survey was conducted from regarded farmers by the researcher himself.

### 3.6 Collection of Data

Direct interviews were done for data collection. Each questionnaire was directly showed the data about respondents related to the study. The respondents were only fish farmers and fish market related intermediaries. Sometimes the respondents were not aware about the costing and required agricultural equipment they used and that's why at the interview time some problems were arise. Some of them didn't want to cooperate by telling their income, expenditure and profit related items. Sometimes, for this reason interview schedule only recorded on the basis of their memory. At their free time, the questions were asked sequentially and in a really clear concise manner. Collected information were recorded on interview questionnaire. In order to ease of data collection, data were obtained in full compliance with their regional units. But after these data were converted into standard units for analysis.

### 3.7 Processing and Data Compilation

Following data collection, each questionnaire was double-checked for consistency and completeness. Before entering the data into the computer, it was edited and coded. All of the collected data were carefully summarized and scrutinized to eliminate any potential error. The data collected from the interview schedule were carefully compiled and inspected by using SPSS 22.0 software. The interpretation and discussion of findings were presented in simple terms, and everything was finally organized and summarized in the context of the study.

### 3.8 Analytical Techniques and Procedures

The marketing cost, gross margin, and value added by the intermediaries in the fish market, producer's share and middlemen's share in the consumer's price, and the factor affecting the marketing margin were estimated in the contemporary study. The methodologies and analysis tools are described in details below

### 3.8.1 Marketing cost

The marketing cost includes the costs of road transport, storage, labor, and other expenses involved in moving the goods through one spot to some other. Point of sale to the client or final point of sale buyer.

The entire cost of marketing was derived from the simple formula -

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Tc}=\mathrm{Cp}+\sum \mathrm{Mci} \\
& \text { Where, } \mathrm{i}=1,2,3----\mathrm{n}, \\
& \mathrm{Tc}=\text { Total cost of marketing, } \\
& \mathrm{Cp}=\text { Producer cost of marketing, } \\
& \text { Mci= Marketing cost by the } \mathrm{i}^{\text {th }} \text { trader }
\end{aligned}
$$

### 3.8.2 Marketing margin

According to Kohls and Uhl (2005), in a sense, the marketing margin is the cost of all utility-adding activities and functions performed by intermediaries. The marketing margin at a given point in the transaction is the difference between the sales price and the purchase price. However, the major factors of profitability in fish marketing are marketing cost and marketing margin of the respective categories of intermediaries. The supply and demand for marketed fish significantly impacts the marketing margin of a given level of business. As a result, the market conditions at the time of buying and selling specify with their sales margins.

The middlemen, wholesaler, (trader, and retailer) gross margins were derived as follows:
$\mathrm{Mg}=\mathrm{Psa}-\mathrm{Pba}$
Where, $\mathrm{Mg}=$ Gross margin,
$\mathrm{Psa}=$ Selling price, $\mathrm{Pba}=$ Buying price,
$\mathrm{Mc}=$ Marketing cost
And the middlemen, (wholesaler, trader) and retailer's net margins or absolute margins were derived as follows:
$\mathrm{Mn}=\mathrm{Psa}-(\mathrm{Pba}+\mathrm{Mc})$
Where, Mn= Net margin
$\mathrm{Psa}=$ Selling price, $\mathrm{Pba}=$ Buying price
$\mathrm{Mc}=$ Marketing cost

### 3.8.3 Producer's share and middlemen's share in the consumer's price

According to S.S. Acharya and N.L Agarwal (2003), it is the farmer's charge expressed as a percentage of the final retailer price (i.e., the price paid by the consumer). The net price received by the farmer at the time of first sale is referred to as the producer price. If Pr is the retailer price, the producer's share of the retail price PS is as follows:
$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{S}}=\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}}\right) * 100$
Where, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}}$ is producer Price or Farm price
$P_{r}$ is final retail price
$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{S}}$ is producer or fish farmer's share on consumer's paid price
And Middlemen share in the consumer's price $=100-\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{S}}$

### 3.8.4 Estimation of different factors affecting the traders marketing margin

Different types of marketing cost generally affect the marketing margin of fish traders. The cost of road transport, packing and unpacking, packaging, commission agent, market toll, individual bills, and other marketing costs mostly have an impact on a fish dealer's marketing margin. Finally, the sale and purchase price also consider as factor. For determining the factor affecting the marketing margin, a multiple linear regression model was estimated by the following formula:
$Y=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} X_{1}+\beta_{2} X_{2}+\beta_{3} X_{3}+\beta_{4} X_{4}+\beta_{5} X_{5}+\beta_{6} X_{6}+\beta_{7} X_{7}+\beta_{8} X_{8}+\beta_{9} X_{9}+\beta_{10} X_{10}+\mu$ Where,
$\mathrm{Y}=$ Net marketing margin, (Tk/quintal)
$B_{j}=$ Coefficient of the respective variables
$\beta_{0}=$ Constant
$\mathrm{X}_{1}=$ Transportation cost, (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{2}=$ Loading and unloading, (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{3}=$ Icing, (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{4}=$ Wastage (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{5}=$ Personal Expense, (Tk/quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{6}=$ Wage, (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{7}=$ Mobile Bill, (Tk/quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{8}=$ others, (Tk/quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{9}=$ Sale Price, (Tk /quintal)
$\mathrm{X}_{10}=$ Cost Price, (Tk /quintal)
$\mu=$ error term

### 3.9 Constraints Faced by Fish Intermediaries

The stakeholders' difficulties or barriers in the study region were assessed through using a survey instrument. Farmers were asked to respond on specific problems identified during the data collection period. A four-point rating scale was used to compute a respondent's constraint score. For each constraint, a score of $3,2,1$, or 0 was assigned to indicate the degree of constraint as high, medium, low, or not at all. The total constraint score for each respondent was computed by summing the scores for all constraints.

The following method was used to evaluate the Constraint Facing Index (CFI)-
$\mathrm{CFI}=(\mathrm{Ch} \times 3)+(\mathrm{Cm} \times 2)+(\mathrm{Cl} \times 1)+(\mathrm{Cn} \times 0)$
Where, CFI = Constraints Facing Index
$\mathrm{Ch}=$ Respondents with a high level of constraint
$\mathrm{Cm}=$ Respondents with a medium level of constraint
$\mathrm{Cl}=$ Respondents with a low level of constraint
And $\mathrm{Cn}=$ Respondents with no level of constraint

### 3.10 Problems Faced during Data Collection

The majority of the respondents in the study regions had never heard of a research project, making it difficult to explain the research's aim and convince them at first. During data collection, certain problems came, such as traders who were engaged with trading and unwilling to speak, some traders believed the researchers for government officials from the tax or other departments, and they were afraid to speak up.

## CHAPTER 4

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE STAKEHOLDER

### 4.1 Preface

The important role of sociodemographic data cannot be overstated, as it is used for a diverse purpose. It can be used for social science research, to assist in developing different policy initiatives, and to identifying probable elements that play a key role in the socioeconomic context. It is a study guidance and starting point for basic information on the topics of research. The purpose of this chapter is to highlight the socioeconomic status of the fish stakeholders. A few parameters with relation to their socio-economic level namely educational level, age, experience and, occupational status, source of finance have been investigated and reported on.

### 4.1.1 Age distribution of fish intermediaries

Age is important in estimating productive human resources. Even though effective management of fish farming activities is reliant on youth and middle-aged persons. One of the most major demographic elements is age. It was observed that the age of $45 \%$ fish intermediaries were 18 to 30 years and around $28 \%$ were range 31 to 40 years old.

Table 4.1: Age distribution of fish intermediaries in the study region

| Age category | No of fish traders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pruraton Bazar | Notun Bazar | Hawkers market | Percentage |
| 18 to 30 years | 10 | 22 | 23 | 45.8 |
| 31 to 40 years | 15 | 12 | 7 | 28.3 |
| 41 to 50 years | 11 | 5 | 6 | 18.3 |
| 51 to above year | 4 | 1 | 4 | 7.5 |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2020

### 4.1.2 Educational profile of fish intermediaries

Education is essential for all individuals to lead a better living. Schooling is pertinent in attempting to make choices in life. An uneducated person is less aware of nutrition, earnings, savings, and so on than an educated individual.

Table 4.2: Educational status of fish intermediaries in the study region

| Literacy level | No of fish traders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pruraton Bazar | Notun <br> Bazar | Hawkers <br> market | Percentage |
| Illiterate | 5 | 9 | 10 | 20 |
| Only can sign | 15 | 12 | 7 | 28 |
| Primary school | 11 | 5 | 6 | 29 |
| Secondary school | 4 | 1 | 5 | 16 |
| Others | 5 | 13 | 12 | 7 |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2020
The table 4.2 shows that $20 \%$ of fish dealers are illiterate, $28 \%$ can only sign, $29 \%$ have primary school and only $7 \%$ are others. So the maximum intermediaries have completed the elementary school level.

### 4.1.3 Occupation status of fish intermediaries

The fish traders are engaged in various forms of income - generating activities. Fish farming was the major occupation of the most of the fish farmers in the study region. According to the field survey, $81 \%$ of fish farmer were engaged in fish farming as their main occupation while $19 \%$ had other sources of income along with fish farming.

Table 4.3: Occupational status of fish intermediaries in the study region

| Occupation Type | No of Fish traders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pruraton Bazar | Notun Bazar | Hawkers market | Percentage |
| Main (fish <br> business) | 30 | 35 | 32 | 80.83 |
| Others as <br> secondary <br> Business | 10 | 5 | 8 | 19.16 |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2020

### 4.1.4 Year of Experience of fish intermediaries

Table 4.4 shows that around $45 \%$ fish traders experience were ranged from 11 to 20 years in this field, $33 \%$ fish trader had experience less than 10 years and $23 \%$ fish traders had more than 20 years' experience in the respective business. So most of the fish traders from selected fish markets were experienced well.

Table 4.4: Year of Experience of fish intermediaries in the study region

| Year <br> Experience | No of Fish traders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pruraton <br> Bazar | Notun Bazar | Hawkers <br> market | Percentage |
| Low (Less Than <br> 10years) | 12 | 7 | 20 | 32.5 |
| Medium (11 to 20 <br> years) | 18 | 23 | 12 | 44.16 |
| High (More than <br> 20 years) | 10 | 10 | 8 | 23.33 |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2020

### 4.2 Concluding Remarks

The socio-economic condition of fish traders were still at the primary stage of growth in the studied area, traders are poor, few credit access to run business, illiterate, most of them competed only the elementary education, Similarity found with Mia (2004) noted that majority of the fish traders had just completed high school and few follow the traditional fish business. It is also found that some traders are involved with other business along with fish trading to maintain livelihood. Moreover, the study emphasized the significance of socio-economic status in the growth of fish farming activities and also be helpful for making any development decision for fish market and other fisheries sectors in Gaibandha Sadar.

## CHAPTER 5

## MARKETING SYSTEM OF FISH

A significant number of individuals are engaged with the fish production, distribution, and marketing systems in Gaibandha Sadar, all of them live in deplorable socioeconomic situations. The present study evaluates existing fish marketing mechanisms, marketing costs, margins \& consumer price share by fish intermediaries at different level in Gaibandha Sadar. The focus of this survey is to explain where fish marketing systems are now. This appraisal is based on secondary and primary data obtained from three major markets in Gaibandha Saddar.

### 5.1 Marketing System

The fish marketing system in Bangladesh is traditional, but it still plays an important role in connecting producers and customers, contributing significantly to the valueadded process. (Alam, 2005) A vast number of people worked in the fish marketing channel as fish farmers, Beparis, Aratdar, Paiker, retailer, exporter, and day laborers. Farmers were the primary producers in the fish marketing systems.

### 5.2 Marketing Intermediaries

## Fisherman

The initial link in the fish marketing chain is fish farmers or fishermen. The fisherman or farmers (producers) of fish generally sell small quantities to paiker/Bepari or to the local Aratdar.

## Aratdar

The Aratdar is the heart of the entire marketing system, and their responsibilities extend well beyond what one would normally expect of a commission agent, including financing of suppliers and purchasers, as well as trading on their own account. (Uddin, 2018) When fish arrives at wholesale marketplaces, Aratdars take charge and control of each transaction. They sell the fish through an auction system and receive a fee ranging from 3 to $4 \%$, depending on the type of fish. Aratdars are often self-funded. Depending on the volume of business, they recruit the necessary salaried employees or laborers.

## Bepari

Paiker and Beparis are theoretically the same but are used interchangeably in different fish marketing systems in Bangladesh that acquire large volume of fish from fishermen. Some paikers/Beparis receive money in advance from the aratdar in exchange for selling their fish via them.

## Faria

Faria is another sort of middleman in the marketing system. They buy a little amount of fish from distant fisherman far from the market.

## Retailer

Retailers, the last intermediates in the fish marketing chain, do not have a permanent establishment but have set locations in the market centre or travel from door to door with hari (aluminium pot) on their heads. Typically, retailers purchase fish from aratdar and sell it directly to the consumer. They mostly buy fish with cash. They may also purchase on credit for short times. If the size of the fish is too enormous, purchasers prefer that it be cut into pieces since cutters have the necessary tools to cut the giant fish. Retailers may cut entire fish for customers or use cutters to remove scales and cut into pieces.

### 5.3 Marketing Channel

The marketing channel refers to the route followed by goods and services from producers to consumers. A channel is often made up of several levels or stages. Each step has a team of intermediaries that do a variety of duties in order to get the product closer to the point of usage. The transit of a commodity from raw to final shape is referred to as the marketing channel. (Shrivastata and Randhir, 1995). The fish marketing channel begins with the fish farmer and concludes with the ultimate customer after going through a number of middlemen. Three major marketing channels are found in the study areas.

Marketing channels of the study areas are shown below-
Channel - I: Fish farmer $\rightarrow$ Aratdar $\rightarrow$ Retailer $\rightarrow$ Consumer
Channel - II: Fish farmer $\rightarrow$ Local agent (Bepari) $\rightarrow$ Aratdar $\rightarrow$ Retailer $\rightarrow$ Consumer
Channel - III: Fish farmer $\rightarrow$ Retailer $\rightarrow$ Consumer


Figure: Marketing Channel of Fish in the Study areas
Source: Field survey, 2020
Fishermen transport fish from rural areas to commission agents for wholesale, with the commission agents charging the farmers a $3 \%$ commission. Traditionally, market communication was carried out through the use of intermediaries. Local Paikers (Beparis) drove the fish (about 60\%) from fish farmers to markets on their own or rented conveyance, then sold them to shops through aratdar. Fish producers, with a few exceptions, rarely have the opportunity to interact directly with clients. Farmers occasionally transport the fish (5\% of the time) to markets and sell them to shops. All of them require Aratdars and binaries to actively participate as a strong link in the existing marketing system.
(Siddique and Rahman, 2003) reported a clear seasonal fish price variation, with the highest being in the summer and the lowest being in the winter.
(Shrivastava and Ranadhir, 1995) concluded that the highest fish price was in the case of the longest marketing channel, which required a significant marketing expense in comparison to gross margin.

### 5.4 Market Information

Market information play significant role in agribusiness section. It is a necessary feature for a properly functioning marketing system. In the early days, market information provision in underdeveloped nations, government agencies collected pricing data and arranged for it to be distributed through newspapers and radio stations. The information given was often inaccurate, and it often came too late to be of practical use to farmers. But now technological advancement makes it easy though mobile or internet.

Table 5.1: Market information in the study region

| Source of <br> Information | Market participants (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fish <br> farmer | $(\%)$ | Bepari | $(\%)$ | Aratdar | $(\%)$ | Retailer | $(\%)$ |  |
| Visit to the <br> market | - | - | 11 | 36. <br> 6 | - | - | 10 | 33.5 |  |
| Fellow <br> Traders | 10 | 33.3 | 15 | 50 | 30 | 100 | 20 | 66.6 |  |
| Mobile | 20 | 66.7 | 4 | 13. <br> 3 | - |  | 5 | 16.6 |  |
| Internet | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |  |

Source: Field survey, 2020

It was found in the study area that about $67 \%$ farmers get information through mobile phone and around $33 \%$ from fellow traders. Fish farmer, Aratdar and retailer get it from fellow traders most of the time. So using the telephone/mobile phone and information in all value chains, fellow dealers are the most frequent providers of market information.

### 5.5 Source of Finance

To manage a business, financial assistance is essential. However, organisational finance is limited in the fisheries sector. As a consequence, extending credit to stakeholders can allow small fish traders maintain and improve their business.

Table 5.2: Sources of Finance in the study region

| Source of <br> Finances | Market Participant (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fish <br> farmer | $(\%)$ | Bepari | $(\%)$ | Aratdar | $(\%)$ | Retailer | $(\%)$ |  |
| Own fund | 5 | 16.6 | - | - | 15 | 50 | - | - |  |
| Bank | 8 | 26.3 | - | - | 6 | 20 | - | - |  |
| Aratdar | - | - | 22 | 73.3 | - | - | - | - |  |
| NGO | 17 | 56.6 | 8 | 26.6 | 9 | 30 | 30 | 100 |  |
|  <br> relatives | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |  |

Source: Field survey, 2020
It was found from Table 5.2 that around $57 \%$ fish farmers took loan from NGOs, $73 \%$ of Bepari took Dadon form Aratdar and Retailer took loans $100 \%$ from NGOs. They have to pay high interest to NGOs which is around $14 \%$. Because it is related to conditions, Aratdar/Mahajan makes fishermen extremely vulnerable. Fishermen that get dadon from Aratdar/Mahajan are obligated to sell their catch to them, sometimes at predetermined prices that are often lower than market rates. They indicated that when they required financial assistance, they were unable to obtain it quickly from institutional sources. They also noted how difficult it was to secure bank lending. It's also a time-consuming matter to get a loan from institutional sources.

### 5.6 Pricing Method

Pricing method is a technique for determining the price of products and services, while considering all of the factors that influence the pricing structure as a whole, such as the product/service, competition, target audience, product life cycle, firm's growth vision, and so on (Halder,1997). The price of several fish groups was reported to be affected by market structure, species, quality, size, and weight. Traders claimed that the price of fish fluctuates daily depending on quantity demanded. In fish trading, different value chain agents use different pricing methods which are categorically grouped below

Table 5.3: Pricing method used by intermediaries in the study region

| Pricing method (\%) | Intermediaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fish <br> farmer | $(\%)$ | Bepari | $(\%)$ | Aratdar | $(\%)$ | Retailer | $(\%)$ |  |
| Open bargaining | 20 | 66.6 | 25 | 83.4 | 30 | 100 | - | - |  |
| Based on-going <br> market price | 10 | 33.3 | 5 | 16.6 | - | - | 16 | 53.3 |  |
| Prefixed price | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 33.3 |  |
| Cost plus method | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 13.3 |  |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |  |

Source: Field survey, 2020
It was found that in the study areas fish trader, fish farmer and Bepari used fixed prices through open bargaining pricing method most of the time, which around $67 \%$ and $83 \%$ respectively. In case of selling small-scale fish, fixed prices, they used based on-going market price which is around $33 \%$ and $17 \%$ respectively (table 5.3). Retailer determined price through based on-going market price most of the time, sometimes on prefixed price for highly demand fish species and in the case of low selling used cost plus method in market.

### 5.7 Mode of Transportation

Transportation is an integral part of the fisheries sector since it allows live, fresh, and preserved fish to be transported from one site to another. (Dewan, 2001) Farmers typically sell their products at the farm gate; it is the responsibility of middlemen to transport fish from farms or processing companies to market buyers. In Bangladesh's interior and offshore water resources, a considerable amount of fish and other fisheries products are captured every day. However, a considerable proportion of fish are damaged or rotting due to a lack of suitable storage and transportation facilities, resulting in a loss of quality. For proper distribution, containers and transporters (fishcarrying trucks) are necessary. These two elements have a significant impact on fish quality. Several types of vehicles were identified to transport the fish during the investigation. These vehicles can be classified as shown in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4: Mode of transportation used by intermediaries in the study region

| Agents | Mode of transportation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fish <br> farmer | $(\%)$ | Bepari | $(\%)$ | Retailer | $(\%)$ |  |
| Rickshaw/Van | 5 | 16.6 | - | - | 8 | 26.6 |  |
| Truck | 2 | 6.6 | 10 | 33.3 | 10 | 33.3 |  |
| Tempo | 15 | 50 | 20 | 66.6 | - | - |  |
| Head loader | - | - | - | - | 5 | 16.6 |  |
| Others | 8 | 26.6 | - | - | 7 | 23.33 |  |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |  |

Source: Field survey, 2020
Table 5.4 shows that fish traders like Fish farmer, Bepari used mostly Tempo (Nossimon) and truck to carry fish to distant market where fisherman and retailer used Van or on head carry fish to near market.

### 5.8 Packaging Practice

This is really the method of putting fish into various materials or containers, such as bags, cans, nylons, and cartons. It is the method for placing fish in any of the containers in order to keep or sell them.

Table 5.5: Packaging practice of fish intermediaries in the study region

| Types of <br> packages | Using materials | Capacity | Used by |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Basket | Bamboo, Rope <br> and Polythene | 40 kg <br> 20 kg | Farmer, Bepari \& Retailer |
| Drum | Plastic | 40 kg <br> 20 kg | Farmer, Bepari \& Retailer |
| Wooden box | Wood, Polythene | 160 kg | Bepari, \& Retailer |
| Box | Cork sheet | 40 kg | Bepari \& Retailer |
| Patil | - | $15-20 \mathrm{~kg}$ | Farmer, Bepari \& Retailer |

Source: Field survey, 2020
Packaging makes fish goods more appealing to marketers and consumers, along with making transportation easy. The effective transportation of fish necessitates the use of packaging. Farmers, Paikers, and dealers of large carps, pangas, and tilapia fish use a bamboo, rope, and polythene 'basket.' Plastic barrels are commonly used to transport live fish. Beparis and retailer use steel and wooden crates in their fish marketing. Fish dealers commonly used 'boxes' to transport and store fish (Table 5.5).

### 5.9 Marketing Cost of Fish Intermediaries

Marketing cost of fish includes all costs incurred by different intermediaries like Faria, Bepari, wholesaler, Aratdar and farmer who perform some marketing functions in the study areas. Products get value added during their movement across items.

Table 5.6: Total marketing cost of intermediaries in the study region (Tk/Quintal)

| Cost items | Fish farmer | Bepari | Aratdar | Retailer | Total | $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation | 56.33 | 99.6 | - | 52.5 | 208.43 | 14 |
|  <br> unloading | - | 100 | - |  | 100 | 6.7 |
| Wage | - | - | 5 | - | 5 | 0.33 |
| Salaries | - | - | 10 | - | 10 | 0.67 |
| Aratdar's <br> commission | 269 | 333.5 | - | - | 602.5 | 40.85 |
| House rent | - | - | 13.73 | 10 | 23.73 | 1.60 |
| Electricity | - | - | 15 | 10 | 25 | 1.69 |
| Security | - | - | 1.5 |  | 1.5 | 0.10 |
| Packaging <br> Materials | - | - | - | 20 | 20 | 1.35 |
|  <br> Icing | - | - | - | 23.63 | 23.63 | 1.60 |
| Mobile Bill | 26.96 | 28.8 | 32.03 | 25 | 112.79 | 7.64 |
| Personal <br> expense | 43.83 | 45.3 | 50.8 | 29.9 | 169.83 | 11.5 |
| Market Toll | - | - | 10 | 10 | 20 | 1.35 |
| Wastage | - | - | - | 10 | 10 | 0.67 |
| Input cost | 320 | - | - | - | 320 | 0.32 |
| Others | 42.83 | 40.66 | 16.467 | 42.83 | 142.78 | 9.68 |
| Total Cost | 438.96 | 646.93 | 154.79 | 233.96 | 1794.6 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2020

Table 5.6 shows the marketing cost and intermediary profit per quintal of freshwater fish in the Gaibandha Sadar market. It illustrates the expenditure incurred by various intermediaries in the marketing chain, from the fish farmer to Bepari through Aratdars/wholesaler to retailer.

The average cost of handling fish (mixed species) per quintal was Tk 1475 (Tk $14.75 / \mathrm{kg}$ ) from farm gate to end client. The greatest component of total marketing expenditure was Aratdars' commissions, which account for around $40.85 \%$ of total marketing costs, followed by personal expenses (11.5\%) and transportation expenditure (14\%). Aratdars receive 55\% of Beparis' total costs in commissions. Beparis are active in the marketing of fish, either as buyers from fish ponds or as transporters from assembly markets to Arat canters. Transportation, labor, market tolls, Aratdars' commissions, containers, and other expenses are included in Beparis' costs. Beparis paid Tk 647 per quintal ( 100 kg ), Aratdar Tk 155, and retailers Tk 234 per quintal (100 kg ). Beparis has the greatest value-added cost of all of them, while Aratdar's value added cost is the lowest.

### 5.10 Marketing margin of Fish Intermediaries

All marketing expenses, as well as profit or loss incurred by all marketing channel intermediaries, are included in marketing margins. The marketing margin is the amount charged by middlemen for any services they provide. (Kohl and Uhl, 1985, p.230)

Marketing margins earned by Fish farmer, Beparis, Aratdar and Paiker/retailer are shown in the following table.

Table 5.7: Total marketing cost, gross margin and net margin of different intermediaries involved in the study region (Tk/Quintal)

| Intermediaries | Purchase <br> Price /cost <br> price | Sale <br> Price | Gross <br> Margin | Marketing <br> Cost | Net Margin |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fish farmer | 320 | 8,467 | 8,467 | 438.96 | 7708 |
| Beparis | 8467 | 12550 | 4088 | 646.93 | 3436.07 |
| Aratdar | - | - | 376.5 | 154.96 | 221.54 |
| Retailer | 12550 | 16,630 | 4080 | 228.46 | 3851.54 |

Source: Field survey, 2020
According to the results of the survey, on average marketing margin for fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar and retailer were Tk 7,708 / quintal, Tk 3436 /quintal, Tk 221.54 /quintal, Tk 3851.54 / quintal. Among them Fish farmers' net margin was the highest
and the Aratdar net margin was the lowest as Aratdars assist buyers and sellers of fish by bargaining between them and facilitating them in buying and selling at their own business premises in exchange for a commission.

### 5.11 Fish Farmer's share and Middlemen's Share in the Consumer's Price

Fish farmer's share to consumer's price $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{S}}=\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}}\right) * 100$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =8,467 / 16,630 * 100 \\
& =49.3
\end{aligned}
$$

Where, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}}=$ Farmer's price, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}}=$ Consumer's price
On average, fish farmers receive $49 \%$ of the price paid by the end consumers, in other words, 51 percent of the consumer price goes to intermediaries which is found similar with producers or fishers share ranged from $49.72 \%$ to $69.74 \% ~(60 \pm 5.4)$ that is relatively higher (Mohammad, 2014).

According to the reports, producers received $50 \%$ of the end selling price of the rohu and shingi fish in commercial fish farming of Mymensigh region. (Ara, 2010).

Nonetheless, due to the presence of a large number of intermediaries, commission agents, and their huge margins, fish producers/fish farmer received only around half to two thirds of the amount paid by the ultimate consumer (Rahaman, 2012).

### 5.12 Factors that Affecting the Marketing Margin

The tabular method was employed to observe the contribution of using various factor inputs to net margin or profit. The focus of the present chapter is to determine the factor affecting the marketing margin a multiple linear regression model was estimated. The estimated values of coefficients related to statistics of the model presented in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Estimated co-efficient of multiple linear regression model

| Variables | Estimated co- <br> efficient | Standard error | P-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | $-131.306^{* *}$ | 51.661 | 0.012 |
| Transportation <br> cost | $-1.257^{* * *}$ | 0.298 | 0.000 |
|  <br> unloading | $-1.682^{* * *}$ | 0.448 | 0.000 |
| Icing | $-1.045^{* * *}$ | 1.238 | 0.004 |
| House rent | -0.016 | 2.876 | 0.996 |
| Electricity | $-0.044^{*}$ | 3.084 | 0.053 |
| Personal expenses | $-0.683^{* * *}$ | 0.241 | 0.006 |
| Wastage | $-0.821^{* * *}$ | 6.476 | 0.000 |
| Wage | $-0.080^{* * *}$ | 14.749 | 0.000 |
| Mobile bill | 1.369 | 0.409 | 0.369 |
| Agent commission | 0.011 | 0.031 | 0.735 |
| Others expense | $-1.032^{* * *}$ | 0.183 | 0.000 |
| Sale price | $0.980^{* * *}$ | 0.005 | 0.000 |
| Cost price | $-0.993^{* * *}$ | 0.005 | 0.000 |

Note:

- The coefficient of multiple determinations $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ indicates the total variations of dependent variables explained by the independent variables included in the model.
- Coefficients were tested for significance level at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent levels of significance where '***', '**' and '*' represents $1 \%, 5 \%$ and $10 \%$ level of significance.


## Value of $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$

The coefficient of multiple determinations ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ), for marketing margin was 0.83 signifying that the individual components in the model represented about $83 \%$ of diversify in fish marketing margin. The following feature noted based on the modelTransportation cost ( $\mathbf{X}_{1}$ )

The regression co-efficient of transportation cost was significant at $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ rise in transportation cost, while holding all other factors unchanged, would result in a 1.257 \% drop in marketing margin.

## Loading \& Unloading( $\mathbf{X}_{2}$ )

The regression co-efficient of loading and unloading expense was significant at $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ rise in lifting and carrying, while keeping all other factors fixed, would result in a $1.68 \%$ drop in marketing margin.

## Icing(X3)

The regression co-efficient at $1 \%$ level, the expense of icing was significant. This meant that a $1 \%$ rise in icing cost would result in a $1.045 \%$ drop in marketing margin, assuming all other factors remained unchanged.

## Personal expenses( $\mathbf{X}_{4}$ )

The regression co-efficient for personal expenses was significant at 5\% level. This meant that a $1 \%$ rise in personal expenses, while holding all other elements unchanged, would result in 0.683 \% drop in marketing margin.

## Wastage( $\mathbf{X}$ )

The regression co-efficient for wastage was significant $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ increase in wastage would result in $0.821 \%$ drop in marketing margin, assuming all other factors held constant.

## Wage (X6)

The regression co-efficient for Wage was significant at the $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ increase in Wage would drop the marketing margin by $0.080 \%$, assuming all other factors remained unchanged.

## Others expense( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ )

The regression co-efficient for the other expenditure was significant at $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ raise in other expenses, while leaving all other parameters fixed, would result in a 1.032 would drop in marketing margin.

## Sale Price ( $\mathbf{X}_{8}$ )

The regression co-efficient for the Sale Price was significant at $1 \%$ level, This meant that a $1 \%$ increase in sale price would expand the marketing margin by $0.980 \%$, assuming all other factors remained unchanged.

## Cost Price( $\mathbf{X} 9$ )

The regression co-efficient for Cost Price was significant at the $1 \%$ level. This meant that a $1 \%$ raise in Cost Price would result in 0.993 percent drop in marketing margin, assuming all other things remained unchanged.

### 5.12.1Concluding Remarks

It is evident from a multiple linear regression model that that the included key variables had significant and positive effect on margin or profit except house rent, electricity, mobile bill, agent commission were statistically insignificant. So, there is a positive effect of key factors in the net margin of fish marketing system in the study area.

## CHAPTER 6

## PROBLEMS FACED BY FISH INTERMEDIARIES

Bangladesh economy mainly dependents on agriculture. But this agricultural sector is negligible still now. In the study areas fish intermediaries faced a number of problems. It was noted that the troubles and difficulties experienced by fish intermediates were not the same as those faced by other fish intermediaries and the problems were differed from one to another. In this section an attempt has been made to identify some major problems in fish marketing system.

## 6. 1 Constraint Facing Index (CFI)

The stakeholders' difficulties or barriers in the study region were assessed through using a survey instrument. Farmers were asked to respond on specific problems identified during the data collection period. A four-point rating scale was used to compute a respondent's constraint score. For each constraint, a score of $3,2,1$, or 0 was assigned to indicate the degree of constraint as high, medium, low, or not at all. The total constraint scores for each respondent were computed by summing the scores for all constraints.

Table 6.1: Constraints faced by the fish intermediaries

| Constraints | Respondents |  |  |  | CFI | Rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High <br> $(\mathbf{3})$ | Medium <br> $(\mathbf{2})$ | Low <br> $(\mathbf{1 )}$ | Not at all <br> $(\mathbf{0})$ |  |  |
| Lack of physical facilities | 35 | 33 | 22 | 3 | 193 | 2 |
| Higher transport cost | 39 | 29 | 19 | 6 | 194 | 3 |
| Unstable production \& price | 33 | 39 | 18 | 3 | 195 | 1 |
| Poor sanitary conditions | 21 | 24 | 14 | 34 | 125 | 7 |
| Drainage problem | 24 | 26 | 21 | 22 | 145 | 6 |
| Lack of effective marketing <br> System | 19 | 25 | 15 | 34 | 122 | 8 |
| Commission problem | 31 | 31 | 21 | 10 | 176 | 5 |
| Unexpected syndicate | 29 | 38 | 22 | 4 | 185 | 4 |

Source: Field survey, 2020

### 6.1.1 Unstable production and price

The respondents' most significant constraint was cost and unstable production. In the peak season, they face excessive supply effect which reduces the price. Most of them suffer from these problems all time. Thirty-five respondents in the study area faced these limits to a high degree, 33 respondents to a medium degree, 22 respondents to a low degree, and around three respondents did not face these constraints. In this scenario, the computed CFI value for each table was 195 , with a range of 0 to 279 conceivable. The problem has a score of 1 , indicating that it is a major issue.

### 6.1.2 Higher transport cost

Higher transport cost was the second highest constraints faced by the respondents. Due to oil price hike, it takes more cost to move from one place to another Thirty nine respondents in the study region faced these problem to a high degree, 29 respondents to a medium degree, 19 respondents to a low degree, and approximately 6 respondents did not face these constraints. CFI was found to be 194 in this scenario, with a potential range of 0 to 279 for each table.

### 6.1.3 Lack of physical facilities

Physical infrastructure should be improved. Market leaders and fish traders must be made aware on how to maintain clean and hygienic surroundings when dealing with fish during in the hot and wet season, fish spoils quickly and readily. This not only decreases prices, but it also jeopardizes people's health. In the study region, 35 farmers encountered these constraints to a high degree, 33 farmers confronted them to a medium degree, 22 farmers faced them to a low degree, and around three farmers did not face them at all. CFI was found to be 193 in this scenario, with a potential range of 0 to 279 for each table.

### 6.1.4 Unexpected syndicate

There are some syndicate who don't allow stakeholders from remote area, businessman from outside areas have to sell at low price to syndicate members. Out of 93 respondents 29 respondents faced the high extent, 38 respondents faced the medium extent and 22 respondents faced the low extent and 4 respondents did not face this extent.

### 6.1.5 Commission problem

Commission problem is another problem. Fish farmer or Bepari have to pay certain amount to road or highway police or local agent to carry the fish to the market that reduce the profit of fish traders. Out of 93 respondents in the study area, 31 faced these constraints to a high degree, 31 faced them to a medium degree, 21 faced them to a low degree, and 10 intermediaries did not face them at all. CFI was found to be 176 in this scenario, with a potential range of 0 to 279 for each table.

### 6.1.6 Drainage problem

Due to improper drainage system, throwing wastage to drain causes water stagnation and also make bad smell all over the fish market. Out of 93 farmers, 24 farmers experienced this constraint to a high degree, 26 farmers experienced it to a medium degree, 21 farmers experienced it to a low degree, and 22 farmers did not experience it at all. In this scenario, the computed CFI value for each table was 145, with a range of 0 to 279 possible.

### 6.1.7 Poor sanitary Conditions

Most of fish market has barely proper sanitation facility that causes to suffer fish intermediaries' different diseases. Out of 93 farmers, 21 farmers experienced this constraint to a high degree, 24 farmers experienced it to a medium degree, 14 farmers experienced it to a low degree, and 34 farmers did not experience it at all. CFI was computed to be 125 in this scenario, with a potential range of 0 to 279 for each table.

### 6.1.8 Lack of effective marketing system

The majority of fish stakeholders are not familiar with fish market management. Effective marketing management can help to sell quality fishes to divisional areas and also ensure to get fair price for their fishes Out of 93 respondents in study area, 19 scored these constraints at high extent, these limits were experienced by 25 respondents to a medium amount, 15 respondents to a low extent, and 34 respondents did not
experience them at all. CFI was reported to be 122 in this scenario, with a potential range of 0 to 279 for each table.

### 6.2 Concluding Remarks

From the above discussion, most of the fish traders were reported that unstable production and price was the main constraint for fish trading. Higher transport cost, lack of physical infrastructure, unexpected syndicate, commission problem, drainage problem, Poor sanitary Conditions, lack of effective marketing system as second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth respectively. If proper scientific way of fish production and monitoring of marketing channel by respective authorities at the right time can be ensured, then the production can be increased significantly and thus the traders may be benefited.

## CHAPTER 7

## DISCUSSION

This section summarizes the research findings based on the study objectives: identify socioeconomic profile, assess the emerging fish marketing system and estimate marketing costs, margins and consumer price share by fish farmer and other intermediaries at the end level and examine the factors that affect marketing margin of the fish traders.

## 7.1 socio-economic profile

From the above study it was found that socio-economic condition of fish traders are still at the primary stage of growth in the studied area, traders are poor, few have credit access to run business and $81 \%$ of fish farmer were engaged in fish farming as their main source of income and most of them competed only the elementary education. Most of the fish traders depend on fish business which is around $97 \%$ and $3 \%$ involves other involved other business along fish trading. (Abdulla et al, 2015) and Fish traders mostly can sign only and have little capital (Rahman et al, 2012) found similarity with this study. Here Author emphasized the significance of socio-economic profile in the growth of fish farming activities and also for making any development activity in the study areas of Gaibandha Sadar.

### 7.2 Fish marketing system, Marketing cost and margins and consumer price share

This study reported that, three major marketing channels are found in the study areas. Most of the transitions occurred through Aratdar which was 95\% and rest 5\% through fish farmer directly to retailers. fish farmers receive $49 \%$ of the price paid by the end consumers, in other words, 51 percent of the consumer price goes to intermediaries. which is found similar with producers received $50 \%$ of the end selling price of the rohu and shingi fish in commercial fish farming of Mymensigh region (Ara, 2010). Studies reported that Producers or fishers share on consumer price ranged from $49.72 \%$ to $69.74 \% ~(60 \pm 5.4)$ that is relatively higher (Mohammad, 2014). Here is some deviation between the two studies because fish marketing margin varies from market to market, location to location, species to species and presence of a large number of intermediaries.

### 7.3 Factors that affecting marketing margin of the fish traders

Total thirteen variables included in the multiple linear regression model-Transportation cost, loading \& unloading cost, Icing, House rent, Electricity, Personal expenses, Wastage, Wage Mobile bill, Agent commission, others expense, Sale price and Cost price. the included key variables had significant and positive effect on margin or profit except house rent, electricity, mobile bill, agent commission were statistically insignificant. Marketing margins would have negative relations with marketing cost due to increased transportation cost, labour, capital cost and level of completion (Cristina, 2005). Similarity the study found that, the cost of transportation, loading and unloading, and icing having higher negative co-efficient values with marketing margin. Therefore, the study concluded that the higher cost of transportation, loading and unloading, icing, wastage and other expenses decreases the marking margin of fish stakeholders.

## CHAPTER 8 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 8.1 Summary

The type and scope of the fish marketing system in the study area were investigated using descriptive and inferential statistics (i.e. cumulative, mean, percentages, rates, etc.). From the viewpoint of stakeholders, per quintal of fish production was evaluated in terms of gross margin, net return or profit, Consumer price share by fish farmer and other intermediaries at end level and factors that affect marketing margin of the fish traders were assessed through multiple linear regression model. The Constraint Facing Index was computed to check the challenges issued by the stakeholders.

The part of north region of Bangladesh (Gaibandha district), fish marketing system is analyzed with an emphasis on productivity and profitability. The fish middlemen were observed to be uneducated, genuinely believed that a minimal level of schooling was required to understand the functioning of the fish marketing system. Result reveals that 29 \% of the respondents had primary level education. Respondents of different categories secondary school and above primary levels constituted 16 and $7 \%$ respectively. Most of the respondents aged between 36 to 55 years accounted for 61.30 \% of the total sampled respondents while respondent's age between 18 to 30 were 45.8 $\%$. There were only $7.5 \%$ sample respondents who belonged to old aged, $81 \%$ of fish farmer were engaged in fish farming as their main occupation while $19 \%$ had other source of income along with fish farming. Approximately 45\% of fish traders have 11 to 20 years of experience in this field. The entire cost of managing fish (mixed species) per quintal averages Tk 1475 (Tk 14.75/kg) from local farms to end buyer. The highest component of total marketing costs is Aratdars' commissions, which account for about $40.85 \%$ of total marketing costs, and personal expenses amount to $11.5 \%$. The end result illustrates that on average marketing margin for fish farmer, Bepari, Aratdar and retailer were $7,708 \mathrm{Tk}$ / quintal, 3436 Tk /quintal, $221.54 \mathrm{Tk} / q u i n t a l, 3851.54 \mathrm{Tk}$ / quintal respectively. On average, fish farmers receive $49 \%$ of the price paid by the end consumer, while intermediaries receive $51 \%$ of the consumer price. Various problems were associated with fish production. The fish intermediaries were allowed to respond against eight structured problem statement. The assertions were set up on a four-point
scale, with responses ranging from 'high' to 'medium' to 'low' to 'not at all,' with scores ranging from $3,2,1$ to 0 accordingly. It was found that fish farmer ranked unstable production and price, higher transport cost, lack of physical infrastructure, unexpected syndicate, commission problem, drainage problem, Poor sanitary Conditions, as first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth place, respectively.

Farmers who identified their problems also suggested measures for the improvement of the existing fish production and marketing system, such as; scientific way of production, supply of inputs and machinery, market monitoring, supply of credit on easy terms, improvement of transportation facilities, formation of farmers' organization and improvement of market facilities.

### 8.2 Conclusions

The study's findings suggest that if scientific way of production, market monitoring to ensure fair price both traders and customers, short- term loan facility, law enforcement to check syndicate can be improved, the performance of fish marketing of the study areas could become a more viable and attractive commercial enterprise, helping to alleviate rural poverty in the study area. Recommendations are key instructions for the fish marketing sector's development.

### 8.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following particular suggestions are given for the improvement of fish marketing system.
> Scientific way of fish production and monitoring of marketing channel by respective authorities at the right time can be ensured, then the production can be increased significantly and stakeholders will be benefited.
$>$ Renovation of the contemporary fish market structure.
> Availability of governmental, institutional, and banking supports.
> Institutional loans could be made available to fish traders on a short-term basis at a time of crisis.
> Value chain participants must be awared about the marketing system, as well as other stakeholders. If the actors were better informed about the value chain, the fish market would be more efficient, and everyone would benefit.
> The extension activities need to be strengthened to give support to the fish farmers.

### 8.4 Limitation of the study

Truth be told, there are some limitations in the study as the study reviewed the farmers of the country through interview schedules.
> Most of the data were collected through interviews of the farmers and sometimes they were not welcoming with the interviewer.
$>$ The information was collected generally through the memories of the growers which were not consistently correct.
$>$ Fish is sometimes cultivated and traded without requiring proper attention \& practices so the record of the costs or earnings were not recalled by the stakeholders.
> In the resource and time constraints, wide-ranging and in-depth studies got affected and hampered to some extent.
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## APPENDIX-1

## Interview Schedule

Marketing system of captured fish in some selected areas of Gaibandha Sadar.
Department of Agribusiness and Marketing
Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka-1207

| Sample <br> No |  |
| :--- | :--- |

## Identification of the respondent (fisherman/ Bepari/Aratdar/ Retailer)

1. Name: $\qquad$
2. Address: $\qquad$
3. Age: $\qquad$
4. Education level (years of schooling): (Literate/only can sign/Primary level/secondary <)
5. Mobile no.: $\qquad$
6. Experience in fish trading (years) $\qquad$
7. Occupation $\qquad$
8. Secondary Occupation.
9. Buying and selling Pattern (Per day product transaction/Kg)

| Market <br> intermediaries | Purchase from (\%) \& price (Tk/kg) |  |  | Sales to (\%) \& Price (Tk/kg) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Farmer | Aratdar | Paiker | Retailer | Paiker | Aratdar | Retailer |
| Farmer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paiker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aratdar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retailer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

10. Mode of transportation used by fish market intermediaries

| Mode of transportation (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Van/Rickshaw | Tempo | Bus | Truck | Boat | Head load | Others (specify) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 11. Grading \& Standardization practices by fish market intermediaries

| Basis | Specification |
| :--- | :--- |
| Weight |  |
| Size |  |
| Cleanliness |  |
| Others <br> (specify) |  |

12. Packaging practices by fish market intermediaries

| Packaging practices | Using materials | Capacity (kg.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Basket |  |  |
| Drum |  |  |
| Box |  |  |
| Wooden box |  |  |
| Steel box |  |  |
| Others |  |  |

13. Pricing methods used by fish market intermediaries

| Pricing method practices (\% of total product) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open <br> bargaining | Based on going <br> market prices | Prefixed <br> prices | Cost plus <br> method | Others(Specify) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

14. Sources of finance of major fish market intermediaries

|  | Sources of finance |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Own <br> fund | Bank | NGO | Friend and <br> relatives | Dadon from <br> Aratdar | Others |
| Amount (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest rate (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 15. Market information

| Sources of information (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Visit to the <br> market | Fellow traders | Telephone/ <br> Mobile | Email/Internet | Others |
|  |  |  |  |  |

16. Marketing cost involved in fish marketing (Tk/100kg)

| Items | volume of trade <br> per month or <br> day | Cost Per month or day | Cost (Tk./100kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Transportation |  |  |  |
|  <br> Unloading |  |  |  |
| Basket/ Container |  |  |  |
| Grading |  |  |  |
| Icing |  |  |  |
| Storage |  |  |  |
| Wages |  |  |  |
| Salaries |  |  |  |
| House rent |  |  |  |
| Security |  |  |  |
| Electricity |  |  |  |
| Toll |  |  |  |
| Polythene |  |  |  |
| Packaging |  |  |  |
| Personal Expenses |  |  |  |
| Wastage |  |  |  |
| Telephone bill |  |  |  |
| Watering |  |  |  |
| Customs clearing |  |  |  |
| License fees |  |  |  |
| Maintenance cost |  |  |  |
| Others |  |  |  |

Obstacles in relevant to fish marketing system in Gaibandha Sadar district:
17. Infrastructure problem
(a) Yes
(b) No
18. Poor sanitary conditions
(a) Yes
(b) No
19. Higher transport cost -
(a) Yes
(b) No
20. Unstable production \& price
(a) Yes
(b) No
21. Drainage facilities
(a) Yes
(b) No
22. Packaging \& storage facilities
(a) Yes
(b) No
23. Commission problem in road
(a) Yes
(b) No
24. Having any unexpected syndicate
(a) Yes
(b) No
25. Knowledge about effective Marketing System
(a) Yes
(b) No

Date:

