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ABSTRACT

The crucial role of agricultural marketing systems in the process of economic development has often been overlooked in the past. This seems to be true for Kenya, as well as for other developing countries, particularly as far as food marketing systems are concerned.

With this background, a proposal is made for further studies on the marketing of maize and beans, the two main staple food crops in Kenya. In the respective marketing systems, the proposed research intends to analyse aspects of marketing effectiveness with regard to the objectives of:-

- keeping marketing risks low, particularly for small-scale producers and urban low-income consumers,

- improving pricing or allocative efficiency (preventing excess profits and market distortions), and

- improving operational efficiency (lowering marketing costs).

This research should be seen in conjunction with the Marketing Development Programme launched by the Government of Kenya with assistance of UNDP/FAO. The researchers will try to contribute some of the necessary information which will be required if feasible programmes are to be developed to improve maize and bean marketing in Kenya.
ASPECTS OF MARKETING EFFECTIVENESS FOR SELECTED FOOD CROPS IN KENYA:
PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

BACKGROUND

Beyond the well known and more or less passive role of marketing systems which consists of the transfer of goods and services from the producer to the ultimate consumer, thereby creating form, time, place and possession utility a more active role is assigned to agricultural marketing systems in the development process. As the agricultural and industrial sector develops and the division of labour and urbanisation increase, the marketing system has to provide the outlets for new and increased output, assure adequate food supply for the growing urban population at reasonable prices and transfer capital and other productive resources from the agricultural to the non-agricultural sectors. Thus, there is not only a strong interrelationship between the increasing productivity of the agricultural sector and the development of an adequate marketing system, but also between the marketing system and the productivity of the other sectors of the economy.

Unless there are adequate and secure outlets for the producers and sufficient food for urban consumers at reasonable prices, the growth of the agricultural, as well as the other sectors of the economy will be hampered. Farmers will hesitate to incur additional costs and efforts if they lack confidence in the marketing system. Moreover, the prices they receive from selling their produce (marketable surplus) influence their cash income and hence their ability to buy products from other sectors, i.e. their demand for non-agricultural products.

At the other end of the marketing channel urban consumers, their disposable income and their demand for agricultural and non-agricultural products will be affected in a similar way by the performance of the agricultural marketing system. The prices they have to pay for food and other agricultural products determine their cost of living and by this the level of demand for agricultural and non-agricultural products. Furthermore agricultural prices, by determining the level of household expenditures required for satisfying basic needs, may influence the level of minimum wages in the modern sectors and thereby contribute to higher production costs in those sectors.

Consequently, an efficient agricultural marketing system has a decisive impact on the incomes and living standards of the entire population and thus
plays an important role in the development process. In addition, the provision of an efficient organisational and institutional arrangement will encourage the accumulation and transfer of capital to the modern sector and may contribute to the development process by providing a source of entrepreneurial talent.¹

The crucial role of agricultural marketing systems in the process of socio-economic development, although it should hardly need stressing, has in fact often been overlooked.² One of the main reasons for this has been that the marketing system in the past has been seen as a self-adjusting mechanism that alters in response to changes in surrounding conditions. This in turn has often led to a neglect of the marketing system in research and planning, and in consequence to reluctance of many governments of developing countries to initiate marketing improvement programmes.³ More attention has been paid to the production process, to new technologies for seeds, fertilisers, irrigation, etc.⁴

In the past this general situation has been true for Kenya, as Wilson pointed out:-

It is not unreasonable to suggest - at least on Kenya experience - that it is the very significance of the technical improvements called for on the production side which has led to a neglect of the structure and organization of the system through which such crops are to be marketed. Thus, although it is not justified to refer to a 'production bias' - at the expense of marketing - there does appear in some cases to be an obvious imbalance in the allocation of research and advisory resources.⁵

However, this relative neglect has been realised recently. In view of the rapid growth of the Kenyan economy, leading to all the effects outlined above - increased marketed agricultural output, specialisation, urbanisation, etc. - and with the intention of transferring production and distribution to Kenyans, a Marketing Development Programme has been launched by the Government of Kenya with the assistance of UNDP/FAO.⁶ It was justified as follows:-

5. Wilson, p.4. A similar conclusion was drawn by Hesselmark and Lorenzl in the case of maize. "The importance of maize for Kenya's economy is well reflected in an increasing number of studies and reports which, however, deal predominantly with aspects of production of maize." O.Hesselmark and G. Lorenzl, Structure and Problems of the Maize Marketing System in Kenya, Zeitschrift für Auslandische Landwirtschaft, 15 (2) 1976, p.1616.
These changes /Kenyanisation, shift from direct farm consumption to marketed consumption/ have taken place without the marketing system being able to adjust adequately, or at the same pace. As a consequence there is strong evidence, though not easily quantified, that the marketing efficiency of the nation has suffered, and this in its turn, affects production (because of uncertainties about outlets) and leads to low income consumers paying disproportionately for the necessities of life.

At the same time the effective development of marketing is inhibited by the general lack within the agricultural and food distribution sectors of a wide range of valid statistics, in particular, statistics needed for the essential correct diagnosis of the constraints in the marketing system.

This applies especially to the internal food marketing system in Kenya as Judith Heyer has shown. It seems therefore to be worthwhile to look into the structure and performance of the marketing system of selected food crops, particularly those which are of crucial importance to the majority of producers and consumers in Kenya. Accordingly, from the major staple food crops in Kenya - maize, beans, rice and Irish potatoes - maize and beans have been singled out for further research.

Maize, providing 50 to 70 per cent of the total calorie intake of the rural as well as urban population, is the main staple food in Kenya. For the majority of households, although not in all regions, beans are most probably second to maize as a staple food, if one considers that wheat, rice and Irish potatoes are mainly consumed by higher income groups.

Most of the total output (more than 90 per cent) of both crops is produced by smallholders, whereas wheat is almost wholly grown on a large scale. Rice is cultivated on irrigation schemes, and thus constitute a special case for production as well as marketing. Potatoes are grown by small-scale producers in certain areas. The marketing of potatoes is the subject of a study now being carried out by G. Duerr and G. Lorenzl.

OBJECTIVES

With the background outlined above, the overall objective of the proposed study is to analyse the constraints and imperfections of the marketing system.
These programmes, if designed to increase production and raise the living standard effectively will have to focus on:

- improving the pricing or allocative efficiency,
- improving the operational or technical efficiency, and
- reducing the risks to producers, intermediaries and consumers.

The pricing efficiency of the marketing system is related to its exchange functions - buying, selling and pricing. To achieve pricing efficiency, these functions have to be performed in such a way that no excess profits are earned by the middlemen and that regional and seasonal gaps between supply and demand are equalised without distortions, so that in consequence an optimal allocation of resources is achieved.

Operational or technical efficiency is achieved if the marketing functions (transportation, storage, processing, etc.) are performed with the minimum possible costs. Thus, improving the operational efficiency of marketing systems focuses on reducing the costs of inputs in relation to the output of goods and services.

The reduction of marketing risks for producers, intermediaries and consumers is related to the uncertainties these people face in the marketing process especially with regard to supply and demand conditions and prices. These risks can lead to the discouragement of investments, misallocation of resources and low consumer satisfaction.

These above mentioned conditions can be viewed as sub-goals or means to achieve to the overall objectives of increasing production and raising the living standard. Thus, the proposed study will concentrate on aspects of pricing and operational efficiency and the uncertainties of the marketing systems as experienced by the participants.

We shall briefly review the specific patterns and problems of the maize and bean marketing systems in order to identify more specific areas of study.
The Case of Maize

The basic structures and problems of the maize marketing system are relatively well known. As far as the structure is concerned, two main, strongly interrelated sub-systems can be distinguished.

On the one hand there is the so-called formal system which consists of the marketing channels controlled by the Maize and Produce Board (MPB), a parastatal marketing organisation, and on the other hand there is the informal free enterprise system which handles the maize which is not subject to MPB control. Although theoretically all maize has to be marketed through the MPB, small quantities are exempted which are traded locally within the districts in the traditional rural markets. Thus, legally the informal system only covers the trade of maize within districts.

Surplus exceeding the local requirements has to be delivered to the Maize and Produce Board either directly to the nearest depot or, when it is in small amounts, through one of the Board's agents who have been appointed all over the country. Larger farmers normally deliver direct to the depots, whereas small farmers sell or are forced to sell their maize to the agents. To assure that all regional surplus is marketed through the Board, all intra- and inter-district movements beyond certain limits require "movement permits". By this system, the Board aims at having full control over all inter-regional flows.

From the depots the maize is sold to appointed traders, millers and stockfeed manufacturers or is exported if total production is estimated to exceed domestic demand.

In contrast to the informal system where prices and margins vary according to supply, demand and competition, prices and margins at all levels of the formal marketing system are fixed. The Ministry of Agriculture announces a basic purchase price for the MPB from which the producer price is derived by deducting several cost items (transport, bags etc.) and the commission for the agent. As transport costs in the past were pooled within a district, farmers in the district were supposed to receive uniform prices.

The MPB ex depot wholesale price, ex mill price and the retail prices for whole maize and maize meal are fixed and announced by the Price Controller.

---

13. From 6th July 1976 on, the pooling of transport costs within districts was given up, which means that no fixed producer prices were announced at the farm gate level.
of the Ministry of Finance and Planning. For the ex depot price, eight different areas are distinguished according to differences in the railway distance from the main producing areas. As the announced retail prices (per kg) are uniform for the whole country, nearly inverse differences in milling and retail margins are fixed which can hardly be economically justified. All prices are usually fixed for one year and without seasonal differences.

The regulation and control of the maize market by the MPB was intended to benefit producers and consumers by:

- guaranteeing a market to producers in surplus areas,
- guaranteeing sufficient supply in deficit areas,
- stabilising producer and consumer prices,
- guaranteeing a regional price structure which does not distort the geographical pattern of production,
- guaranteeing prices so that neither consumers nor producers 'exploit' one another, and
- assuring that the marketing functions are performed at lowest possible costs.

In other words, it was believed that the formal system as it was set up under the prevailing socio-economic conditions could perform the marketing functions best in terms of efficiency and security for producers and consumers.

In practice, however, these objectives have not been fully achieved, as documented by various case studies and a series of public enquiries and commissions. There has been evidence in many cases, for example, that the buying agents of the MPB are not adequate outlets for small farmers, especially in remote areas, that price stabilisation for producers as well as

14. For the retail margin this was only true if maize was sold per kg. If sold per whole bag, the margins seem to be correlated to the ex depot price - in 1975/76 they varied between 2.05 and 2.67 per cent - and therefore do not have an inverse tendency. Calculated according to Table 1 in Hesselmark and Lorenz, p.167.

for consumers has not been achieved and that the movement restrictions have led to unnecessary regional price differentials, creating an extensive illegal trade which enables intermediaries to earn considerable excess profits, while even so supplying consumers in deficit areas with maize at lower prices than the MPB. Moreover, the regional price differentiation of the MPB seems to be insufficient to achieve an optimal spatial allocation of resources, and the absence of seasonal differentiation probably leads to higher costs than necessary.

As pointed out at the beginning, most problems of the maize marketing system are relatively well known. In addition, several proposals for improvement have been made, the most crucial among them to reduce the control exercised by the MPB and to give a larger role to the informal system, confining the role of the MPB to a buyer and seller of last resort. Judging from the shortcomings of the present system outlined above, this would seem to be the first necessary step. However, to implement a new improved system more information on maize marketing as it functions at present has to be obtained. What is actually still required is:-

- an analysis and systematic assessment of the informal system in different parts of the country and its actual and potential efficiency or effectiveness,
- an analysis of the relations between the formal and informal system, the interdependencies between the buying, selling and transfer activities of the MPB and the transactions and prices in the informal system. This has to include the decision making process within the MPB, and
- a comparison of the actual interregional flows with an optimal flow pattern and a comparison of an optimal flow pattern in the case where all transfers are carried out by the MPB (as it is supposed to do at present) with an optimal flow pattern where all transfers are carried out by the private enterprise system, the impact on transfer costs, regional price structure (optimal spatial allocation), and finally the effects on the economies of maize production in different production areas.

16. The extent of the illegal interregional trade on average is about 10 to 20 per cent of the marketed maize crop, and in some cases the share is even higher. Cf. Hesselmark and Lorenzl, pp.185.
With regard to these subsections of the proposed research, some hypotheses which reflect the major areas of interest are listed below. They are as follows:

1. Actual farm gate prices for small scale producers are lower than MPB buying prices. The reasons for this may be limited buying capacity of the Board or its agents at harvest times, bureaucratic procurement procedures or inactivity of MPB agents, particularly in remote areas (unsecure outlets).

2. Marketing margins within the informal system are lower than in the formal system. This might be due to lower overhead and transfer costs.

3. Excess profits are earned in illicit inter-regional trade. This means that marketing margins exceed transfer costs. Reasons may be low market transparency, lack of competition and additional costs and risks in illegal movements.

4. Erratic fluctuations in volumes and prices occur because spatially separated markets are not efficiently interlinked. This might be due to lack of information and infrastructure.

5. Since the storage function is mainly performed by the formal system (no seasonal price differentiation) and MPB is not reacting adequately to given demand and supply situations it contributes to seasonal price fluctuations. These fluctuations in the markets are high; they exceed storage costs.

6. The interregional shipments of the MPB do not follow optimal flow patterns. This might be explained by information and limited transport facilities.

7. The regional price differentiation of the MPB is not commensurate with the objective of allocative efficiency.

8. Interregional exchange would be quicker and cheaper if carried out through the informal system, rather than the present formal system.

9. An optimal regional price differentiation will make maize production in the marginal maize growing areas unprofitable at reasonable consumer prices. Consequently, the production policy has to be reconsidered.
An analysis of all these aspects of maize marketing reflected in these hypotheses will narrow the information gap which still exists and help identify feasible improvement programmes for the maize marketing system. This analysis will show what measures have to be considered if the strict control which is imposed at present on interregional movements of maize is relaxed and it will provide guidance for formulating a production and pricing policy.

The Case of Beans (Dry)

Bean marketing, the second field of interest, has been the subject of very little research in recent years. Therefore very little is known about recent developments in the structure and performance of the marketing system for beans.

A wide variety of beans are grown and sold in Kenya, mainly in certain districts of Central, Eastern, Western and Nyanza Provinces. Except for Mexican 142 which is used by the canning industry, only a minor part of the production above home consumption requirements is sold, usually in local markets.

Officially, as with maize, two different sub-systems, informal (intra-district) and formal (inter-district) can be distinguished. All marketed output beyond district needs is supposed to be delivered to the MPB or their agents at a fixed price and shipped across district boundaries under the control of the Board. Intra-district trade is free. To enforce the regulations the same movement restrictions are imposed on the inter-district flows as in case of maize.

However as it can be seen from the MPB records, this control has not been effective at all. Sales to the Board were negligible (except for Mexican 142). In Eastern and Central Province where beans growing is most important, only 843 bags (other than Mexican 142) were delivered to the Board in 1973/74. In consequence it can be assumed that the legal inter-district trade broke down almost completely, with similar effects as in the maize marketing system: illegal trade, excessive profits, large regional price differences, etc. According to the

20. The most recent research was done in 1966/67 by Alvis and Temu.
22. For example, in June/July 1975 when the price per bag in Kitui was Kshs 185/- in Nyeri it was Shs 370/-. See Schonherr and Mbugua, Bean Production in Kenya's Central and Eastern Provinces, Occasional Paper No. 23, Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi, 1976 (forthcoming).
Latest figures of MPB the situation for 1976/77 may be different.

The minor role of the MPB in recent years can be explained to a large extent by the MPB purchase prices. Although they were raised several times and almost doubled in the period from 1970/71 to 1975/76, they always lagged behind the open market prices which reflected the changing demand and supply situation. During recent years there has been a sharp increase in the demand for beans which has not been met by a corresponding increase in production. 23

There appear to be numerous similarities between the maize and bean marketing systems. Accordingly, after the analysis of the structural conditions quite a similar set of hypotheses can be formulated about bean marketing as about maize, including such aspects as:
- security of outlets,
- profits in intra- and inter-district trade (pricing efficiency),
- interrelation between various markets,
- price fluctuations or price stability,
- marketing costs (operational efficiency), and
- degree of regional price differentiation, etc.

From the preceding pages it can be seen that an extensive research project has to be carried out to provide the information required for the improvement of the maize and bean marketing systems. We cannot tell as yet whether we shall be able to cover all aspects within the available time. However, those areas of research listed above can be viewed as a guide for the steps to be taken in the next future.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Theoretical Framework**

The areas of research listed above refer mainly to the previously mentioned aspects of marketing effectiveness, namely:
- uncertainties within the marketing process,
- pricing (allocative) efficiency, and
- operational (technical) efficiency.

23. Schönherr and Mbugua.
Factors such as security of outlets and the degree of price stability are related to the degree of certainty or risk involved in the marketing process. Evaluation criteria which are frequently used in this connection are as follows:

- frequency and regularity of marketing opportunities,
- capacity of marketing outlets, and
- extent, frequency and amplitude of erratic price fluctuations.

The evaluation is usually done only in qualitative terms because no objective critical values can be given which tell when risks are too high or sufficiently low. The assessment in most cases is based on comparisons between the performance of the marketing system being studied and the performance of similar systems within or outside the country or the performance which is thought to be possible under different conditions. 24

In evaluating pricing or allocative efficiency, a comparison of price differences at different places and times with transfer and storage costs is usually made, as reflected in some of the hypotheses. In making these comparisons, actual performance is measured against the performance of a system operating under the conditions of perfect competition. Assuming perfect competition, price differences between spatially separated markets would be equal to transfer costs, and prices at different times would be determined by storage costs. Moreover, price changes in one market would be followed by corresponding changes in other markets, i.e. they would be perfectly correlated (r = 1). Thus, interrelation of markets, or market integration, another important indicator of pricing efficiency, can be measured by correlation analysis. With coefficients of r greater than or equal to 0.7, the degree of market integration is considered sufficient. 25

In addition to the criteria above, each of them related to specific aspects of pricing efficiency, the efficiency of pricing between various marketing stages is tested by means of regression analysis. This specific test was developed by Ruttan 26 and adds to the assumption of perfect competition that of absolute


constant margins in the short run, i.e. margins independent of short-term fluctuations. Under these conditions a linear relationship between prices at two consecutive stages is hypothesised and can serve as an indicator of whether price changes at one stage are reflected in similar price changes at the other stage.

The questions of optimal regional price differentiation, optimal flow patterns and transport costs within the whole marketing system are inter-related, including aspects of pricing and operational efficiency. In analysing these questions spatial equilibrium models have proved to be very useful.27

The solutions obtained from these models provide a standard against which existing regional price differences, trading patterns and the related transport costs can be compared. These solutions can be used to determine the geographical structure of prices which would lead to an optimal allocation of resources.

For these models, computational procedures have been developed. The first algorithm entitled "reactive programming" was developed by T.E. Tramel and A.D. Seale, Jr.28 Since then an improved version has been developed by R.A. King and Foo-Shiung Ho which is intended to be used in testing the hypotheses we have listed in relation to interregional marketing problems.29

29. King and Foo-Shiung Ho. The basic procedure is described as follows: An initial set of supply and demand quantities is selected and a linear programming subroutine is used to allocate supplies among markets. A market price is calculated from the demand function for each of the consuming areas. By subtracting transportation costs from these market prices net shipping point prices are obtained for the shipments in the initial allocation. A new level of output for the first shipping area is selected consistent with the average net revenue received. This new quantity is then allocated among markets in such a way as to maximize net returns, given the market prices and previous shipping patterns of all other shippers. This same process is repeated for the second shipping area, given the behaviour of all other shipping areas. The iterative routine continues until it is not profitable for any shipping area either to change the level of output or to relocate supplies. ... Several variations of the basic program are available. Supplies may be treated as fixed or entered in functional forms, pp. 1-2.
As can be seen from the preceding presentation, the various aspects of pricing efficiency are usually considered with regard to the 'ideal market' model. This, however, does not necessarily mean that the solution to marketing problems is simply viewed as the establishment of or a return to a system of free and perfect competition, or that the conditions of perfect competition could be achieved in practice or are even to be desired. It only provides a framework for the analysis and for judging the existing systems by a standard of socially desirable results.  

Taking aspects of operational efficiency into account, factors such as economies of scale have to be considered. Thus, a limited number of enterprises may lead to considerable cost advantages (increased operational efficiency) but at the same time may lead to a reduction of pricing efficiency. In such cases the net result has to be assessed in terms of overall economic efficiency. Where large-scale organisations (low-cost monopolies) seem to be necessary, for example for technological reasons, and in consequence a reasonable level of pricing efficiency cannot be achieved through a private competitive system, the question of public control arises if such a system would be beneficial for the whole society. This, however, does not affect the usefulness of the 'ideal market' model as a means of measuring the performance of existing marketing systems. Together with the calculations and comparisons of marketing costs, it provides a valuable analytical tool for evaluating marketing efficiency.

Sources of Data

Two types of primary data will be collected as part of the proposed study, in addition to the available secondary sources of information:

1. A survey of the formal system which will consist of gathering the information available through the Maize and Produce Board, and

2. Surveys on the informal system carried out under the Marketing Development Programme (MDP) by the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS).

The Agricultural Marketing Survey of the MDP is linked with the Integrated Rural Surveys (IRS 1 and IRS 2) of the smallholder sector. Two main

time periods are distinguished. During the first period (April 1976 - July 1977) surveys on consumption patterns in the rural areas (household surveys) and on the working and performance of the rural informal marketing systems (trader and market surveys) are added to the farm household and production surveys of IRS 1. This 'rural survey period' will be supplemented by urban household, trader and commodity and food industry surveys at a later stage (January 1977 - July 1978).

For the IRS farm household survey, a stratified random sample - 1,656 households in 138 sub-locations (clusters) covering 12 cropping zones - has been drawn which will provide representative figures at the provincial level. The market surveys will be carried out in about 100 'representative' markets, representative in the sense that they are viewed as important within certain areas by local authorities who are familiar with the scene and thus will give a fairly good picture of informal marketing activities.

Each survey will cover a period of twelve months in order to fully reflect the seasonality of production, consumption and marketing. The farmers are visited on a monthly cycle, and the market surveys are carried out on a weekly basis. Together, all surveys should provide the necessary data for the evaluation and improvement of the agricultural marketing systems.