



ISSN Print: 2664-844X
ISSN Online: 2664-8458
NAAS Rating: 4.97
IJAFS 2025; 7(5): 315-318
www.agriculturaljournals.com
Received: 20-02-2025
Accepted: 23-03-2025

Shakti Singh
Research Scholar (P.G.),
Department of Agricultural
Economics, SHUATS, Naini,
Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh,
India

Ashish S Noel
Professor and Head,
Department of Agricultural
Economics, SHUATS, Naini,
Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh,
India

Comparative study on marketing of (Nutrikraft and Eva) poultry feed in Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh

Shakti Singh and Ashish S Noel

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2025.v7.i5e.418>

Abstract

Poultry feed is a nutritionally balanced formulation designed to support the optimal growth, health, and productivity of poultry animals such as chickens, ducks, and turkeys. The present study, entitled "Comparative Study on Marketing of Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feed in Chandauli District of Uttar Pradesh," was conducted in Dhanapur block, selected purposively within Chandauli district. Villages with a minimum poultry bird-rearing potential of five percent were identified, and ten percent of respondents from these villages were selected through random sampling. The study investigates and compares the marketing mechanisms of Nutrikraft and Eva poultry feeds through two prevalent channels: Channel-I (Producer → Wholesaler → Consumer) and Channel-II (Producer → Wholesaler → Retailer → Consumer). Findings indicate that marketing efficiency varies between channels and products. For Nutrikraft, Channel-I yielded a marketing efficiency of 10.92%, while Channel-II showed 6.04%. For Eva, Channel-I demonstrated a slightly higher efficiency of 11.21%, compared to 6.52% in Channel-II. Differences in consumer prices, marketing margins, and cost structures highlight the relative advantages of shorter marketing channels in improving producer returns and overall efficiency.

Keywords: Marketing Margin, Marketing Channels, Marketing Cost, Marketing Efficiency, Poultry feed

Introduction

Poultry feed plays a pivotal role in the commercial poultry industry, as it directly influences the health, productivity, and economic viability of poultry farming. It refers to the specially formulated food provided to poultry birds such as chickens, ducks, turkeys, and other domesticated fowls, with the objective of ensuring optimal growth, weight gain, reproductive efficiency, and egg production. A scientifically balanced poultry feed contains essential nutrients including carbohydrates, proteins, fats, vitamins, minerals, and amino acids, tailored to meet the nutritional requirements of birds at various stages of development—such as starter, grower, and finisher phases. The formulation and quality of feed significantly impact the feed conversion ratio (FCR), which is a critical determinant of profitability in poultry farming. In India, the poultry sector has witnessed rapid expansion, particularly in rural and semi-urban areas, where it serves as a vital source of livelihood and nutritional security. The demand for high-quality, cost-effective feed has increased correspondingly, leading to the emergence of various feed brands and a competitive marketing landscape. Feed manufacturers are now focusing on market penetration, efficient distribution networks, and consumer satisfaction to maintain their position in the market. Despite technological advancements in feed production, challenges persist in terms of quality control, pricing, and accessibility in remote areas. Therefore, understanding the marketing dynamics of different poultry feed brands is essential for enhancing supply chain efficiency and supporting poultry farmers.

Research Methodology: The present study employed a purposive-cum-random sampling method for the selection of the study area and respondents. The Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh was selected purposively to minimize logistical challenges and time constraints for the investigator. Within the district, Dhanapur block was chosen based on its high concentration of poultry bird rearers.

Corresponding Author:
Shakti Singh
Research Scholar (P.G.),
Department of Agricultural
Economics, SHUATS, Naini,
Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh,
India

A comprehensive list of villages within the selected block was prepared, and five percent of these villages with significant poultry-rearing activity were randomly selected. From these villages, a list of all poultry rearers was compiled and classified into three size categories based on rearing capacity: Small (less than 500 birds), Medium (501-2000 birds), and Large (more than 2000 birds). A total of 120 respondents were then randomly selected using proportionate sampling across these categories. Additionally, to analyze the marketing aspects, 10 wholesalers, 5 retailers, 5 poultry farm owners, and 5 consumers were selected. The study focused on evaluating marketing cost, marketing margin, price spread, and marketing efficiency. Primary data were collected through a well-structured and pre-tested schedule using the survey method via direct personal interviews. Secondary data were sourced from relevant books, journals, official reports, and records maintained at the district and block headquarters. The data collected were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to derive meaningful insights. The information was gathered during the 2024-2025 Agricultural Year.

Analytical Tools

1. **Marketing Cost:** $C = C_f + C_{m1} + C_{m2} + C_{m3} + \dots + C_{mn}$
2. **Market Margin:** $AMI = P_{pi} - (C_{pi} + C_{mi})$
3. **Price Spread:** Marketing Cost + Market Margin

Table 2: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin, Price Spread and Marketing Efficiency in marketing of Nutrikraft Poultry Feed and Eva Poultry Feed in Channel-I

S. No	Particulars	Nutrikraft Poultry Feed	Eva Poultry Feed
		Value in Rupees/50kg bag	Value in Rupees/50kg bag
1.	Producer sale price to wholesaler	1320	1370
2.	Cost incurred by the producer		
i	Packing cost	11.00	13.00
ii	Packing material cost	10.00	11.00
iii	Transportation cost	12.00	10.00
iv	Market cost	10.00	10.00
v	Labour cost	07.00	07.00
vi	Loading and Unloading cost	05.00	06.00
vii	Miscellaneous charges	18.00	21.00
viii.	Weighing charges	2.00	2.00
	Total cost (i-viii)	74.00	80.00
3.	Net price received by producer	1246	1290
4.	Wholesaler sale price to Consumer	1360	1405
5.	Margin of Wholesaler	40	35
A.	Total Marketing cost	74	80
B.	Total Marketing Margin	40	35
	Marketing Efficiency	10.92%	11.21%
C.	Price Spread	114	115

Table 2: The analysis indicates that the producer-to-wholesaler price for Nutrikraft Poultry Feed and Eva Poultry Feed is ₹1,320 and ₹1,370 per 50 kg bag, respectively. The marketing cost incurred by the producer amounts to ₹74 for Nutrikraft and ₹80 for Eva Poultry Feed. The wholesaler sells Nutrikraft Poultry Feed to consumers at ₹1,360 and Eva Poultry Feed at ₹1,405. The wholesaler's margin in Channel-I is ₹40 for Nutrikraft and ₹35 for Eva Poultry Feed. Consequently, the total marketing cost incurred in

4. **Marketing Efficiency:** $= \frac{\text{Price received by producer}}{\text{Marketing Cost} + \text{Marketing Margin}}$

Results and Discussion

- **Channel I:** Producer - Wholesaler - Consumer
- **Channel II:** Producer - Wholesaler - Retailer - Consumer

Table 1: Reveals the preferred marketing channel by the respondent over buying Nutrikraft poultry feed and Eva poultry feed in the study area

Sr. No.	Channel Type	Nutrikraft Poultry Feed	Eva Poultry Feed
1.	Channel - I	45 (37.50)	40 (33.33)
2.	Channel - II	75 (62.50)	80 (66.67)
Total		120 (100.00)	120 (100.00)

Note: Value in the parenthesis represent the percentage

Table 1: The study revealed that, out of a total sample of 120 respondents, 45 individuals (37.5%) preferred Channel-I for purchasing Nutrikraft Poultry Feed, whereas the remaining 75 respondents (62.5%) opted for Channel-II. In the case of Eva Poultry Feed, 40 respondents (33.33%) indicated a preference for Channel-I, while 80 respondents (66.67%) preferred Channel-II within the study area.

Channel I: Producer-Wholesaler-Consumer

Channel-I is ₹74 for Nutrikraft and ₹80 for Eva. The total marketing margin through Channel-I is ₹40 for Nutrikraft and ₹35 for Eva. The price spread in the marketing of Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feeds through Channel-I is ₹114 and ₹115, respectively. The marketing efficiency for Channel-I is calculated at 10.92% for Nutrikraft and 11.21% for Eva Poultry Feed.

Channel II: Producer-Wholesaler-Retailer- Consumer

Table 3: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin, Price Spread and Marketing Efficiency in marketing of Nutrikraft Poultry Feed and Eva Poultry Feed in Channel-II

S. No	Particulars	Nutrikraft Poultry Feed	Eva Poultry Feed
		Value in Rupees/50kg bag	Value in Rupees/50kg bag
1.	Producer sale price to wholesaler	1320	1370
2.	Cost incurred by the producer		
i.	Packing cost	11.00	13.00
ii.	Packing material cost	10.00	11.00
iii.	Transportation cost	12.00	10.00
iv.	Market cost	10.00	10.00
v.	Labour cost	07.00	07.00
vi.	Loading and Unloading cost	05.00	06.00
vii.	Miscellaneous charges	18.00	21.00
viii.	Weighing charges	2.00	2.00
	Total cost (i-viii)	74.00	80.00
3.	Net price received by producer	1246	1290
4.	Wholesaler sale price to Retailer	1335	1390
5.	Marketing cost incurred by Wholesaler		
i.	Loading & Unloading charges	3	3
ii.	Carriage up to shop	2	3
iii.	Weighing charges	2	3
iv.	Town charges	5	5
v.	Transportation	4	4
vi.	Losses & Miscellaneous charges	6	6
	Total cost (i-vi)	22	24
6.	Margin of Wholesaler	15	20
7.	Retailer Selling price to Consumer	1430	1464
8.	Margin of Retailer	95	74
A.	Total Marketing cost	96	104
B.	Total Marketing Margin	110	94
	Marketing Efficiency	6.04%	6.52%
C.	Price Spread	206	198

Table 3: The findings reveal that the producer-to-wholesaler price for Nutrikraft Poultry Feed and Eva Poultry Feed is ₹1,320 and ₹1,370 per 50 kg bag, respectively. The marketing cost incurred by the producers is ₹74 for Nutrikraft and ₹80 for Eva Poultry Feed. The wholesaler sells Nutrikraft Poultry Feed to retailers at ₹1,335 and Eva Poultry Feed at ₹1,390, earning a margin of ₹15 and ₹20, respectively, in Channel-II. The retailers sell Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feed to consumers at ₹1,430 and ₹1,464, respectively. The profit margin earned by the retailers is ₹95

for Nutrikraft and ₹74 for Eva Poultry Feed. Accordingly, the total marketing cost in Channel-II amounts to ₹96 for Nutrikraft and ₹104 for Eva. The total marketing margin realized in Channel-II is ₹110 for Nutrikraft and ₹94 for Eva Poultry Feed. The overall price spread in the marketing of Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feed through Channel-II is ₹206 and ₹198, respectively. The calculated marketing efficiency for Channel-II stands at 6.04% for Nutrikraft and 6.52% for Eva Poultry Feed.

Table 4: Comparison of Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin, Price Spread and Marketing Efficiency in marketing of (Nutrikraft and Eva) Poultry Feed through Channel-I and Channel-II in the study area.

Poultry Feed					
S. No.	Particulars	Nutrikraft	Eva	Nutrikraft	Eva
		Channel I ₹/50kg bag	Channel I ₹/50kg bag	Channel II ₹/50kg bag	Channel II ₹/50kg bag
1.	Net price received by the producer	1246	1290	1246	1290
2.	Consumer's Paid Price	1360	1405	1395	1434
3.	Total marketing cost	74	80	96	104
4.	Total Marketing margin	40	35	110	94
5.	Marketing efficiency	10.92%	11.21%	6.04%	6.52%
6.	Price Spread	114	115	206	198

Table 4: The study identified two existing marketing channels for Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feed in the Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh. In Channel-I, for Nutrikraft Poultry Feed, the net price received by the producer was ₹1,246, while the consumer paid ₹1,360 for a 50 kg bag. The total marketing cost incurred was ₹74, with a marketing margin of ₹40, resulting in a price spread of ₹114. The marketing efficiency of Channel-I for Nutrikraft was calculated at 10.92%. For Eva Poultry Feed in Channel-

I, the producer received a net price of ₹1,290, and the consumer price was ₹1,405. The total marketing cost stood at ₹80, and the marketing margin was ₹35. The price spread was ₹115, and the marketing efficiency was 11.21%. In Channel-II, the marketing of Nutrikraft Poultry Feed showed a net price of ₹1,246 received by the producer, with a consumer price of ₹1,394. The total marketing cost was ₹96, and the marketing margin was ₹110, resulting in a price spread of ₹206. The marketing efficiency for Channel-II

was 6.04%. For Eva Poultry Feed through Channel-II, the producer received ₹1,290, and the consumer paid ₹1,434 for a 50 kg bag. The marketing cost totaled ₹104, and the marketing margin was ₹94. The price spread was ₹198, with a marketing efficiency of 6.52%.

Conclusion

The study highlighted notable differences in the marketing of Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feed across two channels in the Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh. Channel-I was preferred by a smaller proportion of respondents for Nutrikraft Poultry Feed (37.5%), while Channel-II was favored by the majority (62.5%). Conversely, for Eva Poultry Feed, Channel-II was preferred by a larger proportion (66.67%) compared to Channel-I (33.33%). The marketing efficiency was found to be higher in Channel-I for both products, with Nutrikraft at 10.92% and Eva at 11.21%, indicating that Channel-I offered greater cost efficiency. On the other hand, Channel-II exhibited higher price spreads and marketing margins, suggesting higher profitability for intermediaries but at a greater cost to consumers. The findings emphasize the trade-off between marketing efficiency and profitability, with Channel-I being more efficient and Channel-II offering greater margins for the intermediaries. These insights are valuable for stakeholders in the poultry feed industry, providing a better understanding of the dynamics of different marketing channels and assisting in the optimization of marketing strategies for both Nutrikraft and Eva Poultry Feeds in the region.

References

1. Abadula TA, Jilo SA, Hussein JA, Abadura SZ. Poultry production status, major constraints, and future prospective. *J World's Poult Sci.* 2022;1(1):22-28.
2. Achoja. A study on constraints in marketing of poultry feed in Delta Central Agricultural zone. *J Consum Res.* 2023;33(12).
3. Asrar A, Ahmad I. Marketing strategy of animal feed for laying hens: Case study of PT. Cahaya Mario Brother Group. *Indones J Econ Manag Sci.* 2023;1:213-126.
4. Inaniya A. An assessment of marketing channels of poultry products and constraints faced by poultry producers in Udaipur and Ajmer districts of Rajasthan. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2021;10:1712-1717.
5. Baliyan BO, Masuku MB. Socio-economic factors as determinants of farm management skills among broiler poultry producers in Botswana. *Int J Mark Financ Serv Manag Res.* 2017;2(4):109-117.
6. Gbigbi TM, Chuks-Okonta VAA. Performance analysis of poultry feed marketers in Delta State, Nigeria. *J Agric Econ Dev.* 2020;9(1):1-10.
7. Singh H, Masih VA. An economic analysis on marketing of Nutrikraft poultry feed in Chandauli District of Uttar Pradesh. *Int J Innov Sci Res Technol.* 2023;8(7):2590-2594.
8. Rahman MM, Rahman MM, Alam MS, Alam MS. Socio-economic status of the farmers and economic analysis of poultry farming at Gazipur district in Bangladesh. *Indian Vet J.* 2005;82:407-409.
9. Firdaus M, Yusuf M, Arsyad M. Profile of the poultry system and the socio-economic impact of native

chicken farming in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Anim Prod Sci.* 2023;63:149-157.

10. Nikita. Study on supply chain management of poultry feed on Udaipur and Ajmer district of Rajasthan. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.; 2021. p.134.