

**EFFECT OF MARKETING COST ON MARKETING MARGIN REALIZABLE
FROM BEEF SALES IN BENIN CITY, NIGERIA**

Abstract

There has been a continuous problem of price and sales volume fluctuation over the years as a result of marketing inefficiencies which has led to short supply of beef and beef products as well as a threat to the livelihood of families that depend on beef business for survival. The short fall in supply of cattle has often been linked to the high cost of cattle marketing. This study therefore focused on the analysis of factors that determine the marketing margin realizable from beef marketing in Benin City Metropolis. The primary data used in this study were generated from the random sampling of 120 respondents, through the administration of well structured questionnaire. Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics, tables and multiple regression analysis. Results from the study showed that majority of the marketers were married (85%), fairly educated with good marketing experience and still in their active age of production (87.5% were within the age bracket of 30-39 years). Result of the regression analysis indicated that marketing cost (packaging, handling, processing, and transportation costs) explained about 91% of the systematic variation in the marketing margin realized from beef marketing in the study area. It was also shown that unavailability of credit facilities, high cost of transportation, high marketing charges and perishability of beef were the most serious constraints faced by the marketers. The study therefore recommended the provision of mobile cold rooms at rentable costs for improved transportation and hence, reduced perishability of beef. This would go a long way in sustaining the business of beef marketing in the study area.

Key words: Beef, Benin City, Constraints, Livelihood, Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin.

1. Introduction

The flesh of bovine animal that is in butchery is called beef. It is used generally to refer to the meat of a heifer, cow, bull, young bull, bullock or steer, even if the tenderness and flavour may vary greatly. In Nigeria, there is high rate of spoilage of agricultural products (including beef), arising from poor storage and transportation facilities thereby hampering the total supply of food reaching the consumers' table (Okuneye, 2002). According to the National Livestock Project Division (NLPD, 1992), The supply of cattle and its product have been declining while the demand has been increasing, the short fall in supply of cattle has often been linked to the high cost of cattle marketing, because the cattle are brought from the Northern part of the country to the South, usually there is high cost of transporting the cattle considering the long distance that the traders have to travel with them.

Other factors that can also affect marketing of beef include, market policy, marketing development, market infrastructure, market information, and enabling environments. Marketing margin also constitute a major component of the high prices of these products. It is alleged that the involvement of too many middlemen in the marketing of animal products and by-products leads to an inefficient distribution system, high marketing costs and margins.

There has been a continuous problem of price and sales volume fluctuation over the years as a result of marketing inefficiencies which has led to short supply of beef and beef product. Also, it is a known fact that most agricultural product are bulky, perishable and highly prone to microbial attack which leads to their deterioration in quality and finally results in the spoilage and wastage of these products.

A lot of families depend on the business of beef marketing for sustenance. Beef cattle trade provides the largest livestock market in the country. Millions of Nigerians make their livelihood from beef enterprises as cattle grazers/nomads, butchers, beef producers/processors, veterinary services providers, marketers, transporters and providers of several ancillary services. Government agencies also realize a lot of revenue from the beef industry through various forms of levies, market charges and direct taxation.

There is therefore a very serious need to ensure the survival and sustainability of this important industry so as to avoid any subtle threat to the livelihood of the numerous families that depend on beef business for survival. The key research questions that come to mind are: What are those cost components that determine the margin realizable from beef marketing by the average beef marketer in Benin City? Are there serious constraints that could threaten the survival of the average marketer in the business of beef marketing in Benin Metropolis? The Specific objectives of this study were thus to:

- examine the socio-economic characteristics of beef marketers in Benin Metropolis
- determine the effect of marketing costs on marketing margin realizable from beef sales and
- examine the various constraints faced by marketers of beef in the study area.

Beef forms an important aspect in the diet of people living in Benin City and those marketing it also depend on it as a source of livelihood. An analysis of the effect of beef marketing cost on marketing margin of this nature is intended to identify possible gaps that could help improve the livelihood of the persons involved in beef marketing, and as such ensure the sustainability of the business.

2. Materials and Methods

Area of Study:

The area for this study is Benin City, Edo State. The study was carried out at the main abattoir in Benin City, as well as other slaughtering slabs and some major markets in the City between June and August 2011. Edo State is one of the 36 States of Nigeria and it lies within the geographical co-ordinates of Longitudes 05° 04' East and 06° 43' East and Latitudes 05° 44' North and 07° 34' North of the Greenwich. It is bounded in the North by Kogi State, in the South by Delta State, in the West by Ondo State and in the East by Kogi and Anambra States. The Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Benin metropolis are Oredo, Egor, Ikpoba-Okha and Ovia North-East.

The City is characterized by two climatic seasons: the rainy season between April and October, and the dry season between November and March. The vegetations identified in the State are mangrove Forest, Fresh Swamp and Savannah vegetations. The mean annual rainfall in the southern part of the State is about 252mm-254mm, with average temperature ranging from a minimum of 24°C to a maximum of about 33°C.

The main occupation of the people is farming and carving. They also engage in other occupations like livestock farming, small and medium scale business and engage in jobs done by Artisans. Many of the civil servants engage in farming on part-time basis.

Data Collection Method:

Primary data that were used for this study were collected through the use of well-structured questionnaire administered to respondents and through personal interviews. The sampling frame was drawn from the list of registered butchers in Benin main abattoir, other slaughtering slabs and some markets (Oba, New Benin and Uselu) in Benin City. This list was obtained from the Registered Butchers' Association in Benin City. Information gathered from reconnaissance

survey indicated that there are about 300 registered butchers in Benin main abattoir and about 100 others scattered around the ten slaughtering slabs in Benin.

A simple random sampling method was used in selecting 120 respondents from the sampling frame of the registered butchers in Benin. Half of this (60) were selected from the main abattoir while the remaining (60) were selected from the other slaughtering slabs and markets to give a total of 120 respondents.

Data Analysis:

The socioeconomic characteristics of respondents in the study area were analyzed using a table and descriptive statistics. The Linear Regression Model was used to determine the effect of marketing costs on the marketing margin realizable from the marketing of beef in Benin City.

The model in explicit form was stated as:

$$MM_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HC_i + \beta_2 PC_i + \beta_3 PRC_i + \beta_4 TRC_i + \mu_i \dots\dots\dots [2]$$

Where: MM = Marketing Margin; PC = Packaging cost; HC = Handling cost;

PRC=Processing Cost

TRC = Transportation cost; μ_i = Stochastic error term.

The various constraints faced by marketers of beef in the study area were ranked in a five-point Likert-type scale (which is an ordinal level of measurement), as adopted from Emokaro and Erhabor (2005) and Ugwoke *et al.* (2005). Responses to the various constraints were scored in a way that the response indicating the most serious constraint was given the highest score of five. These responses were grouped into five thus: Very serious (VS) = 5; Serious (S) = 4; Moderately Serious (MS) = 3; Least Serious LS = 2; Not Serious (NS) = 1. For a given constraint, the mean was computed by summing the score on each item and then dividing by the total number of responses. Any mean was less than three ($\bar{x} < 3$) indicates that the particular constraint is not

very serious while any mean equal to or greater than three ($x \geq 3$), indicates that the constraint is a serious.

3. Results and Discussion

Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondent:

Data analysis shows that 52.5% of the respondents were female beef marketers while 47.5% were male (Table 1). This suggests that beef marketing in Benin metropolis is both male and female oriented business.

The result also shows that 87.5% of the beef marketers fell within the age of 30-39 years and 11.7% were in the age bracket of 20-29 years while only 0.8% of them were in the range of 40-49 years of age. This implies that majority of beef marketers in Benin metropolis were between the ages of 30-39 years, which is an indication that most of the respondents were still in their active age.

The result presented in Table1 also shows that 85% of the respondents were married while only 15% of them were single. There was no respondent for the, widowed, and divorced categories. This suggests that majority of beef marketers were men and women with wives and husbands respectively. This is in agreement with the study carried out by Afolabi (2007), an indication that beef marketing can be a source of livelihood for households.

The result also shows that 88.3% of the respondents were in the 1-5 and 6-10 categories of family size represented by 53.3% and 35.0% respectively. Only 11.7% of the respondents were in the family size category of above 10. This implies that most of the beef marketers in Benin had large household sizes.

The result in Table1 also shows that beef marketers with secondary education had the highest proportion (62.5%) and 25.8% had primary education. This suggests that most of the beef

marketers in Benin metropolis had primary education and could access formal sources of information that could improve their business. This is so because education improves the ability of farmers (and marketers) to make accurate agricultural (marketing) decisions and to innovate (Williams and Williams, 1982; Omoregbee, 1996 and van der Ban and Hawkins, 1996). According to World Bank report, the output of an educated farmer is about 13% higher than that of the uneducated. The obvious reason for this is that, the educated and literate farmer has the added advantage of knowing with little promptings, the rules of application of production inputs in order to achieve optimum result.

Again the result presented in Table 1 shows that 31.7% of the marketers had been in the business for 6-10years. This was closely followed by those with marketing experience of 26-30 years (23.3%) and those with marketing experience of 11-15 years (21.7%). This suggests that the beef marketers scarcely leave the business, an indication of stability.

Table 1: Socioeconomic Characteristics of Beef Marketers in Benin Metropolis

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender: Males	57	47.5
Females	63	57.5
Total	120	100
Age (Yrs.): 20-29	14	11.7
30-39	105	87.5
40-49	1	0.8
Total	120	100
Marital status: Married	102	85.0
Single	18	15.0
Total	120	100
Family Size (Persons): 1-5	64	53.3
6-10	42	35.0
>10	14	11.7
Total	120	100
Level of Education:		
No formal education	12	10
Primary education	31	25.8
Secondary education	75	62.5
Tertiary education	2	1.7

Total	120	100
Marketing Experience (Yrs):		
1-5	5	4.2
6-10	38	31.7
11-15	26	21.7
16-20	10	8.3
20-25	13	10.8
26-30	28	23.3
Total	120	100

Source: Field Survey 2011.

Effect of Marketing Costs on Marketing Margin Realizable from Beef Sales in the Study Area:

Results presented in Table 2 shows the relationship between marketing margin and marketing cost incurred by respondents in the beef marketing effort. A critical examination of the result shows that marketing cost (packaging, handling, processing, and transportation costs) explained about 91% of the systematic variation in marketers' margin. This implies that only about 9% of the variations in marketing margin were unexplained by the marketing cost incurred. The F-statistics which shows the overall "goodness of fit" of the model shows that there is a significant linear relationship between the marketing margin and marketing cost taken together at 5% level of significance. Also, all the independent variables were significant at 1% level of significance. The coefficients of the packaging and processing costs were 12.34 and 7.64 respectively while those of handling and transportation costs were -1.00 and -0.32, respectively. These are in line with *a priori* expectation. The results showed that a unit increase in handling and packaging costs will respectively increase marketing margin by ₦7.64 and ₦ 12.34 while a unit increase in the handling and transportation costs will decrease marketing margin by ₦ 1.00 and ₦ 0.32 respectively. The result of the regression of marketing costs on the marketing margin of wholesalers in the study area is also indicated in Table 2. The result shows that the packaging cost, handling cost, processing cost and transportation cost explained over 81% of the variations in the marketing margin for beef in the study area. The linear model fit the variable well as

indicated by the F-statistic significant level (1%). However, only the packaging and handling costs were statistically significant at 1% level. The coefficients of the packaging and handling costs were 15.37 and -0.98 respectively. The result shows that a unit increase in packaging and processing costs will increase marketing margin by ₦ 15.37 and ₦ 1.65 while a unit increase in the handling and transportation costs will decrease marketing margin by ₦ 0.98 and ₦ 0.41, respectively. The result of the regression of marketing costs on the marketing margin realized by retailers in the study area is also presented in Table 2. The result shows that packaging cost, handling cost, processing cost and transportation cost explained over 89.7% of the variations in the marketing margin realized by beef marketers in the study area. Again, the linear model fit the variable well as indicated by the F-statistic significant level (1%). Also, all the independent variables were significant at 1% level of significance. The coefficients of packaging and processing costs were 15.92 and -2.86 respectively while those of handling and transportation cost were respectively -1.02 and -0.24. The result is an indication that a unit increase in packaging cost will increase marketing margin by ₦15.92 while a unit increase in the handling, processing and transportation costs will decrease marketing margin by ₦ 1.02, ₦ 2.86 and ₦ 0.24 respectively. Again, these findings are in consonance with the report by Erhabor *et al.* (2008), that transportation cost, cost of packaging, marketing and processing charges were the main cost components of beef marketing in Edo State and Emokaro and Ekunwe (2009), who reported that transportation cost and other variables were major determinants of income realizable from snail marketing in Benin City.

Table 2: Parameter Estimates of the Marketing Models

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Entire sample				

PACKAGING	12.34	1.08	11.42	0.00
HANDLING	-1.00	0.04	-23.80	0.00
TRANSPORT	-0.32	0.11	-2.90	0.0075
PROCESSING	7.64	1.84	4.15	0.0001
Constant	35.04	19.57	1.79	0.076
R-squared	0.91			
Adjusted R-squared	0.83			
F-statistic	311.00			0.0000
Wholesalers				
PACKAGING	15.36	5.17	2.97	0.0086
HANDLING	-0.97	0.26	-3.73	0.0019
TRANSPORT	-0.40	0.56	-0.71	0.4830
PROCESSING	1.65	6.28	0.26	0.7950
Constant	8.67	107.02	0.08	0.9360
R-squared	0.81			
Adjusted R-squared	0.76			
F-statistic	18.52			0.0000
Retailers				
PACKAGING	15.92	1.08	14.74	0.0000
HANDLING	-1.01	0.05	-20.20	0.0000
TRANSPORT	-0.24	0.14	-1.71	0.0908
PROCESSING	-2.86	0.38	-7.52	0.0000
Constant	21.07	249.41	0.84	0.4000
R-squared	0.89			
Adjusted R-squared	0.72			
F-statistic	204.38			0.0000

Source: *Computed from Field Survey Data, 2011.*

Constraints Faced by Marketers in the Marketing of Beef in the Study Area:

A summary of constraints faced by beef marketers in the study area is presented in Table 3. From the Table, unavailability of credit facilities, high cost of transportation, high marketing charges

and perishability of beef were the most serious constraints faced by the marketers, since these variables had means of at least three ($x \geq 3$) while, the constraints of high processing cost and poor storage facilities had means less than three, and as such, were not regarded as major constraints to beef marketing in the study area. These findings corroborate earlier finding from the regression analysis on the significant effect of marketing costs on marketing margin realizable from beef sales. The implication is that serious attention must be paid to these constraints if the business of beef marketing must be sustained in the study area.

Table 3: Constraints Faced by Marketers in the Study Area

Constraints	Mean value (x)	Standard deviation
Unavailability of Credit	3.5889	1.41337
High Cost of Transportation	3.5856	1.39137
High Marketing Charges	3.5075	1.71776
Perishability of Beef	3.0976	1.70007
High Processing Cost	2.7941	1.47143
Poor Storage Facilities	2.3944	1.52577

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

It has been shown in this study that beef is mainly marketed in Benin City by predominantly married, fairly educated and experienced respondents still in their active age of production. The major factors that determined the marketing margin realizable from beef sales were shown to be packaging, handling, processing and transportation costs. It was also shown that unavailability of credit facilities, high cost of transportation, high marketing charges and perishability of beef were the most serious constraints faced by the marketers. This is an indication that, to a large

extent, improvement in the livelihood of beef marketers in the metropolis could be achieved by helping to ameliorate these constraints. Also, the amount of funds the marketers are willing to commit to these aspects of marketing cost would go a long way in determining what they would realize in terms of profit margin. Based on this, it is safe to recommend that:

- Government and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) as well as other Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) should help in the provision of mobile cold rooms at rentable costs for improved transportation and hence, reduced perishability.
- Efforts should be made to make credit facilities available and sensitize marketers of beef on the need to invest wisely on critical aspects of beef marketing cost so as to ensure increased profitability and by extension, improved livelihood and sustainability of the business.

References

- Afolabi, J. A. (2002). **An Analysis of Poultry Eggs Marketing in Ondo State, Nigeria.** *Proceeding of the 27th Annual Conference of the Nigerian Society for Animal Production (NSAP).* Federal University of Technology, Akure. 17-224p.
- Afolabi, J.A. (2007). **Evaluation of Poultry Egg Marketing in South-Western Nigeria.** *International Journal of Poultry Science* 6 (5): 362-366.
- Asumugha, G.N., Lemka, D, Njoku, M.E., Ogbonna, M., Okoye, B.C., Dung, E and Nwosu, K.I. (2008). **An Analysis of the Marketing Channels and Efficiency of the Marketing System for Yams in Nigeria.** *Proceedings of the 10th Annual National Conference of the Nigerian Association of Agricultural Economists (NAAE).* University of Abuja. Pp 548-555.

Emokaro C.O. and Ekunwe, P.A. (2009). **Determinants of Income Realizable from Snail Marketing in Benin City, Nigeria.** *Journal of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries* 10 (1&2): 35-38.

Emokaro, C. O. and Erhabor P. O. 2005. **Comparative Analysis of Input use and profitability among cassava farmers in the three Agro-Ecological zones of Edo State, Nigeria.** *Journal of sustainable Tropical Agricultural Research* 19:16-22.

Erhabor P. O., Ahmadu, J. and Ingawa, S.A. (2008). **Efficiency of Beef Marketing in Edo State, Nigeria.** *Proceedings of the 10th Annual National Conference of the Nigerian Association of Agricultural Economists (NAAE).* University of Abuja. 570-577p.

Ikpi, A. E. (1990). **Livestock Marketing and Consumption in Nigeria from 1970-1989.** An unpublished Research in the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Page 36-39.

John, A. and O. Olaniyan (2003). **Improving Market Institutions and Urban Food Supply for the Urban Food Supply for the Urban Poor, Tomato Retail Marketing in Jos, Nigeria.**

National Livestock Project Division, (1992). **NLPD Survey in Kaduna Nigeria** vol. 58: 175-177.

Okuneye, B. (2002). **Livestock Sub-Sector in Nigeria; Challenges and Prospects.** In: *Diversification of the Nigeria Economy: Policies and Programmes for Increasing Agricultural Output*, Mordi, C.N.O., Nnanna, O.J., Ukpony, G.E. and Adepegba, A. (eds), Central Bank of Nigeria Billion 26 (3): 16-22.

Omoregbee, F.E. (1996). **Communication of Improved Farm Practices to Rural Women Contact Farmers in Benue State, Nigeria.** An Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of

Agricultural Extension and Communication, University of Agriculture, Makudi, Nigeria.150p.

Oyenuga, V.A. (1987). **Fundamental Strategy for Livestock Production in Nigeria.** *Journal of Animal production.* 14 (1): 20-25.

Ugwoke, F. O.; Matthews-Njoku E. C and Onu D. O. (2005). **Constraints of Self-employment in farming: case of participation in the Agricultural Sector Employment Programme in Enugu State.** *A Technical Report.* Enugu State Government. Pp. 47.

van den Ban A.W. and Hawkins, H.S. (1996). *Agricultural Extension:* Black Well Science Ltd. Netherlands, Pp. 202-216

Williams S.K.T. and C.E Williams,. (1982). **Analytical Study for Extension service, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Western State of Nigeria.** *Bulletin of Rural Economics and .Sociology.* Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan. 7(19) :81-101.