


1 M
KMSCT

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



(This is a sample cover image for this issue. The actual cover is not yet available at this time.)

This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Branding and agricultural value chains in developing countries: Insights from Bihar (India)

Bart Minten^{a,*}, K.M. Singh^b, Rajib Sutradhar^c

^a IFPRI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

^b ICAR, Patna, India

^c JNU, New Delhi, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 January 2011

Received in revised form 21 June 2012

Accepted 23 September 2012

Keywords:

Agricultural marketing

Asia

Food retail

India

Branding

ABSTRACT

Local brands are rapidly gaining agricultural market share in developing countries. However, it is not well understood how they reshape agricultural value chains. In a detailed case study of the value chain of *makhana* in Bihar, we see the fast emergence – a doubling over 5 years – of more expensive packed and branded products. The effect on consumers is ambiguous. While the emergence of brands leads to increasing differentiation in retail markets, the brands in these settings provide however mostly incomplete or misleading information for the consumer and quality contained in branded bags is often lower than for loose products. We further also find that there are little direct benefits to the farmers from the presence of these brands.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Significant changes are happening in food and agricultural markets in a large number of developing countries. They concern most importantly the emergence of modern retail in food retail (Reardon et al., 2010) and the increased consumption of high-value agricultural products (Gulati et al., 2007; Delgado et al., 2008). Rapid market changes have led to a large body of research to better try to understand the impacts on producers, consumers, and on the food system as a whole (e.g. Reardon et al., 2010; Pingali, 2007; Swinnen and Vandeplas, 2010; Maertens and Swinnen, 2009).

One of the changes in food systems that has recently been documented is the rapid emergence of packed and branded products of retailed food in Asia (e.g. Pingali, 2007; Minten et al., 2010a,b). For example, the sales of branded rice in traditional markets in Beijing increased by 8% over the course of 5 years (Reardon et al., 2010).¹ Similar patterns are seen in other developing countries, e.g. in a recent study in Delhi, it was shown that 31%, 70%, and 78% of all rice, wheat *atta*, and mustard oil sold by traditional retailers was branded (Minten et al., 2010a).

While unbranded and unpacked products are indistinguishable from those of competitors, marketing of packed and branded

produce adds a 'brand value' to products which enables sellers to charge higher prices for their products. The real benefit for the brand-owner occurs over time as the loyalty of the consumers to the brand and the cheapness of retaining these loyal customers, compared to the costs of attracting new ones, make it a profitable enterprise for a branding firm (e.g. Anholt, 2005). The benefits to consumers are guaranteed quality or food safety (Berges-Sennou et al., 2004).

The available analysis in the international development literature on branding in food markets has been limited to the study of the switch from manufactured labels to private retail labels, often linked with the emergence of modern retail (e.g. Reardon et al., 2003), or the effects of the development of brands for export markets in developed countries (e.g. Ponte, 2002). Despite its growing importance in local agricultural value chains in developing countries, few studies have looked empirically at what the effects are in local – traditional as well as modern – retail markets, what the impact is of the branding process on economic agents working along the value chain, and what potential policy implications are. To fill that lacuna, we present the case study of *makhana* (*Euryale ferox*) in Bihar, one of the poorest states in India. *Makhana*² is an interesting product because it is almost exclusively commercialized from this state, quality distinction is easy and branding and packing for this crop was not started until recently. It is thus a unique case study on the development of local brands in developing countries and its implications for the functioning of the value chain.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: b.minten@cgiar.org (B. Minten).

¹ Given that modern retail has grown at 23% over the same period (Reardon et al., 2010) and given that modern retail almost exclusively sells branded products, the effective importance of brands has even grown more.

² Also called fox nut or gorgon nut.

The contributions to the international literature of this study are threefold. First, this is the first analysis that documents, based on primary survey results, the fast emergence of brands in agricultural value chains in poor settings in India. In a 5 year period, the share of branded products increased from 25% to 50% of the total market. It is quite possible that similar fast growth rates happen in other value chains in India, and beyond, and it then raises important questions on the implications of this trend.

Second, we implement a unique study setup where stacked surveys were fielded for all agents in the value chain. By using such a methodology, we are able to document where the costs and benefits of brands in the value chain occur. While the retail prices of these brands are significantly higher than those of loose products, we find however that there are little direct benefits to the farmers from the emergence of these brands.

Third, a typology of brands in this developing market shows that two types of brands can be distinguished, low-price and high-price brands. Low-price brands focus exclusively on attractive glossy packaging with little consideration for quality and with no investments in advertising. Investments are small and so are price differences with loose products. The high-price brands pay attention to quality beyond packing, invest in advertisements and promotion, and employ specialized salesmen. We find that both types of brands are characterized by incomplete or misleading information for the consumer.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In 'Conceptual framework on changes in the agricultural value chain', we present a conceptual framework. 'Background' provides background information on the product studied. In 'Data', the data collection methodology is discussed as well as some descriptive statistics. Following the setup of agricultural value chains, we analyze pricing, packing and branding upstream in 'Downstream', midstream in 'Midstream', and downstream in 'Upstream'. In 'Price composition', we look at the price composition of the whole value chain. We finish with conclusions and implications in 'Conclusions'.

Conceptual framework for changes in the agricultural value chain

Various drivers are quickly changing food demand in a number of developing countries. These drivers include, most importantly, (1) urbanization (a larger share of the population in developing countries is living in urban centers; given that population growth in these countries is often high, a rapid increase in the urban population overall is usually seen); (2) income growth (an important increase in average incomes and a reduction in poverty levels has been seen in a number of developing countries in recent years); (3) changing lifestyle and female participation in the workplace (women have traditionally taken care of agricultural production and/or food preparation, but as they are increasingly entering into the urban labor force, they often have less time to spend on these activities); and (4) increasing access to better technologies (these include, at the household level, the spread of refrigerators, microwave ovens, and gas stoves, which allow for the use of different foods and food preparation methods, and at the industry level, access to better food packaging technology).

These changes have led consumers in developing countries to demand a different food basket: (1) the quantity, per person and overall, that is demanded from urban food markets is increasing faster than in rural areas; (2) the composition of the food basket is different, as better-off consumers often shift away from grains and consume relatively more high-value products such as fruits and vegetables, dairy products, meat, and fish,³ as well as more

processed food for convenience; (3) there is a demand for more choices per product and a greater variety of food products in general; and (4) consumers in developing countries are also increasingly concerned about quality and safety issues with regard to their food, especially as safety issues tend to be more correlated with non-staple foods.

The changing requirements of consumers lead to a restructuring of food supply chains. The final food supply chain arrangements are, however, shaped not only by these demand factors. Conditioning factors such as geography,⁴ the population structure,⁵ the structure of the financial sector, and the reliability of the justice system, among others, are important in shaping the final outcome of the chain. Policy factors also play an important role, be it regulation, hard infrastructure, institutions, international trade, or foreign direct investment (FDI) rules.⁶

Changes in the supply chain are ultimately transmitted to the rural producer. His or her production environment and livelihood might change due to the different crops. Such changes could be in the overall amount required to grow and variations in input and output prices. Moreover, other types of labor, land, inputs and technologies may be used, and new requirements of the market, including transaction requirements (such as postharvest handling) might translate into additional investments. The producer's behavior is, however, influenced not only by market forces but by non-policy conditioning factors and policy factors as well. The rural nonfarm economy will often strongly condition the ability of the farmer to make the requisite investments to respond to the requirements of the transformed supply chain (Reardon et al., 2007).

The differential pull and push factors lead to a difference in food supply chains across countries and products – as reflected in different types of institutional arrangements, which range from spot market exchanges to full vertical integration, in which the stages of marketing, transaction, and production are linked through ownership rather than through market exchanges (Swinnen, 2007). The effects of changes in food supply chains – such as branding – on poverty are strongly debated in the literature. Minot and Roy (2007) distinguish four pathways by which they might affect poor farmers and poverty overall: through a direct effect on farm income, through backward linkages to agricultural input suppliers, by changing wages and employment, and by affecting the food prices faced by consumers. However, research in this area is still limited.

Background

Makhana is an aquatic crop that is largely grown in Northern India. Though *makhana* is also found in wild form in China, Japan and Russia, India is the only country where *makhana* is cultivated as a crop, mainly in the states of Bihar and some parts of Assam (Mishra et al., 2003). *Makhana* as a crop can be cultivated in any shallow and stagnant pond. *Makhana* has shown important production increases in the last decades and *makhana* cultivation has endogenously, (without public research or extension intervention), spread to off-season rice fields in the districts of Bihar. It is estimated that *makhana* cultivation done in ponds accounted for 90% of total production 10 years ago, while 65% and 35% of current production comes from ponds and ricefields respectively.⁷ No improved varieties for *makhana* are currently available and higher *makhana* yields

⁴ For example, Reardon et al. (2007) show how changes might be strongly related to geographical locations.

⁵ Increasing urbanization leads to an increasing scarcity of labor in rural areas and might, through induced innovation, force the adoption of new, less labor-intensive technologies.

⁶ See Reardon and Timmer (2007) for a more detailed discussion of this point.

⁷ Personal communication, Dr. Jha, Senior Scientist, Research Centre for *Makhana*, Darbhanga.

³ This shift is more commonly known as Bennett's law (Bennett, 1941).

can only be achieved by improved pond management, especially the application of organic matter in the pond, as well as irrigation.

Makhana pop has several uses. It is a highly relished food consumed as namkeen, kheer, curry, etc. (Mishra et al., 2003). *Makhana* pop is traditionally consumed as a snack; high-protein, low-fat food; or sweet component; and it has been used in traditional medicine (World Bank, 2007). *Makhana* further holds special importance in cultural and social life of Bihar. It is considered obligatory for brides' parents to send *makhana* to the house of the groom to serve the latter's family before the marriage. It is usually eaten with betel and betel nut. It is also used as a part of final rituals in the case of death.

In traditional *makhana* markets, four quality types of pop are distinguished, i.e. *lava*, *murha*, *turi*, and *mix*. The differences in quality are almost exclusively linked with the size of the pop. *Makhana* transactions in these traditional markets are done in gunny bags. These gunny bags are standardized in size and the weight of such a gunny bag is indicative of the quality of *makhana*. If *makhana* is processed well, *makhana* pops are larger and weigh less and a low-weight bag is thus an indication of good quality. The general rule of thumb is that a bag of 8 kg is an indication of high quality *lava makhana* and a bag that weighs more than 10 kg contains mostly lower quality *makhana* (*murha* and *turi*).

Data

Data collection

It is estimated that Bihar accounts for more than 80% of total *makhana* production in the country which takes place in 20 out of its 38 districts, mostly situated in the North of the state. Darbhanga, the district where the survey was fielded, is one of the most important *makhana* producing districts in Bihar. It is estimated that about 30,000–40,000 people are involved in the *makhana* sector in Darbhanga. The total *makhana* area cultivated in Darbhanga amounted to about 1200 ha in 2009. This compares to a total of 15,000 ha in Bihar. Also, increased commercialization has been noted over the years. While before the 2000s, only a tiny share of *makhana* was exported outside the district, it was estimated in 2009 that almost 60% was sent outside.³

In preparation for the study, extensive key informant interviews were conducted in the middle and end of 2009. We also had several talks with the manager of Shakti Sudha Industries, the largest processing and branding company of *makhana* so as to understand their procurement, processing, and sales practices. The information collected in this stage helped in the design of the survey instruments, especially given the complex production and processing processes involved in *makhana* pop production.

Different types of surveys were set up in the beginning of 2010. They included surveys with *makhana* producers and village leaders, and wholesale and retail traders. In the selected district, 12 *makhana* producing villages were randomly selected in the largest *makhana* producing block (Manigachi). In each selected village, a questionnaire was implemented. In each selected village, a census of households was conducted to enumerate all the *makhana* producers. Each household in the village was asked questions on their total area of ponds and *makhana* cultivation. From all the *makhana* cultivators, 18 households were then randomly selected. For all the selected households, a detailed household survey was conducted. 217 *makhana* producing households were effectively interviewed in total, one above the target of 216, i.e. 18 households times 12 villages.

Patna is the capital of Bihar and the largest city in the state and is a major demand sink for a large number of agricultural products

sold in the state. As a significant part of *makhana* from the district of Darbhanga was marketed in this town, we fielded a survey there to better understand the downstream part of the value chain. We implemented a survey of *makhana* retailers in 50 colonies in the city of Patna. The city of Patna has 72 wards. Ten wards were randomly selected and then five colonies in each of those 10 wards. A complete census of retailers that were selling *makhana* was done in each colony. A survey was then implemented with four retailers randomly chosen from the census list. In total, we interviewed about 150 retailers, lower than targeted as in some colonies not enough retailers could be found.

Simultaneously, a wholesale questionnaire was implemented with all the wholesalers in Patna (a census of the wholesalers) and in the rural production areas where the producer survey was being fielded (as well as with a small number in Delhi), reflecting trade flow from producers to ultimate consumers. Twenty-three wholesalers were interviewed.

As a main indicator that we wanted to study in this analysis was the level of prices that are offered to different agents in the value chain, careful information was collected at each level on these prices. This information allows us thus to analyze the price composition along the value chain and compare price composition for loose versus branded and packed products. To better understand price formation at different levels in the value chain, additional variables were also collected that could potentially explain price formation on top of packing and branding. Such variables included quality indicators, quantities sold, place and time of sales, type of buyers, inter-linkages, and payment modalities.

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the interviewed *makhana* farmers. Two-thirds of the producers are member of a fishermen cooperative society but only very few are members of any other farmers' organization. The households involved in *makhana* cultivation are relatively poor, even for Bihar standards, as seen by several indicators (Table 1).⁴ The average number of ponds cultivated by the household is 2.1. While almost half of the farmers only cultivate *makhana* in one pond, 13% of the households reported to cultivate more than three ponds. The average pond area cultivated per household is 4.8 acres and the average production per household in 2009 was 3.1 tons of *makhana* seeds.

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics on characteristics of the two agents, wholesalers and retailers, on top of the farmers that were interviewed in the value chain study. First, 23 wholesalers were interviewed in different markets, i.e. 57% in Patna, 26% in the production areas (Darbhanga and Madhubani), and 17% in Delhi. Wholesalers declare to procure, on average, about 7 tons per week in the beginning of the July to September harvest period. This then increases to an average of about 11 tons per week in the period of January to March. Compared to 5 years ago, there has been a doubling of the procurement quantities by these wholesalers, possibly indicating the fast growth of the commercial *makhana* sector (as indicated by several key informants).

Second, 154 retailers were interviewed in the city of Patna. Only some retailers are street hawkers and most of the *makhana* is sold by *kirana* stores, i.e. family owned and operated stores represented 97% of those interviewed. The quantities that are sold of *makhana* were low and amount only to 5 kg per week per store and retailers declare that this product makes up just over 4% of their sales and profits. It is

³ Personal communication, Dr. Jha.

⁴ Ninety three percent of the households belong to the *mallah* (i.e. fishermen) caste. While some key informants indicated that other farmers than the *mallah* caste were often cultivators of the pond and that the role of the *mallah* caste – the traditional producers and processors of *makhana* – was basically reduced to wage labor for pond-owning or – leasing households, this is thus not borne out by our data, at least in the survey area.

Table 1
Characteristics of makhana farmers.

	Statistics		
	Unit	Mean or %	Median
Number of observations	Number	217	
<i>Background information household</i>			
Age head of household	Years	49	45
Household size	Number	7.3	6.0
Gender of head of households	% Male	100	
Illiterate heads of household	%	48	
Holder of a Below the Poverty Line (BPL) card	%	63	
Holder of a Above the Poverty Line (APL) card	%	38	
Holder of an Antyodaya card	%	5	
Belong to the Mallah caste	%	93	
Perceived wealth: compared to other households in the village, would you describe yourself as...			
... among the richest in the village	%	5	
... richer than most households	%	5	
... about average	%	29	
... a little poorer than most households	%	32	
... among the poorest in the village	%	25	
... the poorest in the village	%	3	
Member of a fisherman cooperative society	%	65	
Member of any other farmers' organization (self-help group)	%	5	
Distance to closest wholesale market	Minutes	34	30
<i>Makhana cultivation and production</i>			
Number of ponds cultivated	Number	2.15	2.00
Number of households that cultivate only one pond	%	47	
Number of households that cultivate more than three ponds	%	13	
Area of ponds cultivated for makhana	Acres	4.83	2.00
Total production of makhana seeds in 2009	kg	3177	1280

Table 2
Descriptive statistics agents value chain surveys.

	Statistics		
	Unit	Mean or %	Median
<i>Wholesalers</i>			
Number of observations	Number	23	
Location of trader			
Dharbangha	%	13	
Madhubani	%	13	
Patna	%	57	
Delhi	%	17	
Quantities procured weekly in July–September	Tons	6.8	2.0
Quantities procured weekly in January–March	Tons	10.6	4.0
Quantities procured weekly in July–September 5 years ago	Tons	4.1	1.0
Quantities procured weekly in January–March	Tons	5.1	2.5
Number of suppliers weekly procured from in July–September	Number	10.7	4.0
Number of suppliers weekly procured from in January–March	Number	16.6	5.0
<i>Traditional retailers</i>			
Number of observations	Number	154	
% Of makhana retailers that are kirana stores	%	97	
Number of years since start with retailing of this product	Years	9.3	7.5
Quantities sold	kg/week	5.3	2.0
Share of makhana in total retail sales	%	4.1	1.0
Share of makhana in total retail profit	%	4.3	1.9
Value of assets	1000 Rs.	51	16
Value of assets	1000 USD	1.1	0.4
Working capital	1000 Rs.	117	80
Working capital	1000 USD	2.6	1.8

thus clearly a minor product in the sales portfolio for most of these stores. Values on asset values and working capital are shown at the bottom of the Table 2. They show that most retail stores are rather small operations, i.e. the average value of assets and working capital are evaluated at 1100 USD and 2600 USD respectively.¹⁰

¹⁰ Retailers were asked the price at which they thought they would potentially be able to sell the different assets that they owned to conduct their business. These were then added. Working capital is that amount of money that the retailer has at his/her disposal to purchase products (without credit).

While seemingly little has changed over time on the production and processing side of *makhana*, however we note important changes downstream in the value chain, especially related to packing and branding practices. Table 3 shows the importance and emergence of packed and branded produce, as reported by wholesalers. Ninety-six percent of the interviewed wholesalers report that they are currently selling packed and branded products which now account for almost half of their total sales. This compares with only 23% 5 years ago. The rather recent take-off of branded products is

Table 3
Importance and emergence of branding as reported by wholesalers.

	Statistics		
	Unit	Mean or %	Median
Number of wholesalers that sell branded produce	%	96	
Share of branded produce in total sales now	%	47	50
Share of branded produce in total sales five years ago	%	23	10
Year that wholesaler started selling branded products ^a			
2009–2008	%	9	
2007–2006	%	18	
2005–2004	%	45	
Before 2004	%	27	
Importance of branded produce by season			
July–September			
In supply	%	25	30
In sales	%	41	45
January–March			
In supply	%	24	30
In sales	%	49	50

^a Only calculated for those wholesalers that have been in business for a long period.

illustrated by the year that these wholesalers started selling branded produce.¹¹ While almost all wholesalers were selling branded products at the time of the survey, only 27% were doing so before 2004. A large number of wholesalers (45%) started selling branded products in the years 2004–2005, the apparent year of major take-off.¹²

The data thus indicate that there is a fast emergence of these branded products. This then begs the question regarding how this branding process works. Wholesalers were asked about the share of branded products in their sales as well as in their procurement. The numbers show that the share of branded products is twice as high in sales as it is in procurement, indicating that a large part of the branding is done by the interviewed wholesalers themselves. However, it also indicates some wholesalers buy branded products and then re-sell them.

In the next sections, we try to better understand the implications of the rapid emergence of these brands. We look consecutively at effects downstream (with the retailers), midstream (with wholesalers), and upstream (with farmers). In the last section, we compare price composition of the branded and packed versus loose products over the value chain as a whole.

Downstream

To understand the rewards of packing and branding in retail markets, price data were collected for all *makhana* products that were being sold by *makhana* retailers in Patna. Information was also collected on the size of the pop, type of bags, the location of the sale as well as on characteristics of the retail shop. The results of a hedonic price regression where these factors are included as explanatory variables are reported in Table 4. The estimation of such a model, where we control for these different confounding factors, allows us to get at the benefits from branding and packing downstream in the value chain. The logarithm of the price of *makhana* in Rs. per kg is used as the dependent variable. Ward and colony dummies are included in all specifications as to control for possible location-wise unobserved heterogeneity. Standard errors are estimated after accounting for within cluster (ward) correlations and possible heteroskedasticity.

¹¹ This statistic was only calculated for those wholesalers that had been in business for a long enough period.

¹² It is well known in survey research that recall data typically peaks at intervals such as 5 or 10 years. There might thus be some error in the exact year. See Ravallion (2012) on problems of recall in socio-economic surveys.

The results show that the *lava* quality (the default value in the regression) is rewarded with a premium, compared with a mixed and *murha* quality, of 11% in the retail market.¹³ *Makhana* products sold in *kirana* shops are on average, (controlling for confounding factors), not cheaper than those sold by street hawkers. Focusing on our major variables of interest, the regression results show significant rewards to branding and packing in retail markets. Non-branded but packaged products are sold at prices that are 11% higher than loose products and branding adds another 10% on top of this, amounting to a price difference with loose products of 21%.

As expected, we find significant price effects of branding and packing in the retail market. To better understand perceptions at the retail level on branding, a number of questions were asked to the retailers (Table 5). While almost all wholesalers sell branded products, their importance is much less in the retail market of Patna as only 19% of retailers sell branded products, indicating that a large number of the branded bags handled by wholesalers in the city are sold outside Patna (and mostly in bigger cities outside the state). For those retailers that sell branded products, they almost exclusively sell branded products as they account for an important percentage in total sales for these retailers (92%). In contrast with wholesalers (who better know what actually goes into the bags as we will see later), the majority of *makhana* retailers that sell branded products believe that the quality of these branded products is higher (73%).

Retailers were also asked to evaluate why they think their consumers are interested in branded products (Table 5). All retailers believe that because of the branding, customers are assured of receiving the right quantity of the product. Only just over half of the retailers believe that customers would buy brands because of better quality. Retailers that were selling branded products were also asked to state why they were selling these branded products. Only a small number indicated that this was done because of higher profits but they prefer the branded products because of a reduction in hassle and transaction costs (as no weighing and quality checking by customers was required) and because of the increase in demand for these branded products by customers. When asked about the type of customers that would buy these branded products, the majority of retailers believed that these were richer customers (68%) than those buying loose products.

¹³ The *murha* coefficient is not statistically significant. However, there were only a few *murha* observations in our dataset and comparison might be a bit difficult because of this.

Table 4
Price effects of packing and branding in the retail market.

Dependent variable = log(Rs./kg) ^a	OLS		
	Unit	Coeff.	t-Value
<i>Characteristics product</i>			
Loose (default)			
Low-cost brand	Yes = 1	0.21	2.17
Packed but non-branded	Yes = 1	0.11	2.25
<i>Size lava (default)</i>			
Size murha	Yes = 1	-0.11	-1.39
Size mixed	Yes = 1	-0.11	-2.32
<i>Characteristics shop/owner</i>			
Sold by kirana shop	Yes = 1	-0.08	-0.80
Experience in retail of product	Years	0.00	-2.16
Age of owner	Years	0.00	0.20
Number of years of education	Years	-0.01	-2.33
Household size	Number	0.00	-0.99
Intercept		5.81	51.73
<i>Colony and ward dummies included but not reported</i>			
Number of observations		156	
R-squared		0.52	
Root mean square error		0.11	

^a Standard errors estimated after accounting for within cluster(ward) correlations and possible heteroskedasticity.

Table 5
Perceived impact of branding and packaging, as reported by retailers.

	Unit	% Of answers
Total number of observations		154
Number of retailers that sell branded makhana	%	19
For those retailers who sell branded products,		
The importance of sales of branded in total sales	%	92
<i>In his opinion, compared to loose is the average quality of branded produce</i>		
Better	%	73
Same	%	7
Worse	%	20
Total	%	100
<i>In his opinion, why do some customers prefer branded produce (compared to loose)?</i>		
Assured quality of the product	% Very important	57
Assured quantity of the product	% Very important	100
Nice package	% Very important	80
<i>Why does he sell branded produce?</i>		
Higher profits than loose	% Very important	17
Less hassle with customers (no weighing, no quality checking)	% Very important	100
Consumers demand branded produce	% Very important	93
<i>In his opinion, customers who buy branded produce are</i>		
Richer	%	68
Same	%	32
Poorer	%	0
Total	%	100
<i>Who printed the Maximum Retail Price (MRP) price on the package</i>		
Retailer himself	%	7
Trader he bought from	%	93

Midstream

Low-priced brands

As shown before, the branded products graded and packaged by wholesalers themselves have taken off in recent years. These are called the low-price brands from here onwards. Wholesalers were asked detailed questions on each branded product that they were selling at the time of the survey (Table 6). Because wholesalers might sell different brands, this gives us 61 brand observations in total. Despite the recent start of brands and the rather small market, the results show that there are already a large number of brands out there, as 33 different brand names were identified in

total. There are no clear market leaders and the most frequently observed brand, *Swagat*, accounted for only 13% of all the brands found.¹⁴ Of all the brands on sale, 31% were packed by the wholesalers themselves and a quarter of the branded bags were sold exclusively by that wholesaler.

Branded bags contain in general 250 mg of popped *makhana* (97% of the branded bags). The type of *makhana* found in the bag is usually a mix of qualities, and in only a few cases (9% of the bags) it is indicated that only the best quality ('*lava*') is in the bag. Quality assurance is often assured by the wholesaler himself (35%). There

¹⁴ Ramaswami et al. (2009) found similar results in the proliferation of brands in cotton seed markets in India.

Table 6
Description branding practices, as reported by wholesalers.

	Unit	Share
Number of observations/brands ^a		61
<i>Brand name</i>		
Welcome (Swagat)	%	13
Krishna's Devotee (Gopi)	%	11
Safron (Kesar)	%	11
The Goddess of Wealth (Laxmi)	%	8
Lavkush – The Children of Lord Ram (Lavkush)	%	3
Smile (Muskan)	%	3
Royal Food (Rajbhog)	%	3
Colorful (Rangeela)	%	3
Rest ^b	%	47
<i>Branding and wholesalers</i>		
Packaged by wholesaler himself	%	31
<i>Size of bag</i>		
250 mg	%	97
500 mg	%	3
<i>Type of makhana</i>		
Lava	%	9
Mix	%	91
<i>Quality assurance by wholesaler himself</i>	%	35
<i>Differences in quality by bag, as stated by wholesaler</i>		
A lot	%	13
A bit	%	38
None	%	48
<i>Designed bags exclusively used by wholesaler</i>	% Yes	25
<i>Information on bag</i>		
Exact weight printed	% Yes	80
Expiry date printed	% Yes	16
Exact contact address manufacturer printed	% Yes	0
Telephone number manufacturer printed	% Yes	5
Maximum Retail Price (MRP) printed (versus blanc)	% Yes	0

^a Several brands are sold per wholesaler; there are thus more brands than wholesalers interviewed.

^b Include Pation Food (Amrit Bhog), Priceless (Anmol), Lord Balaji (Balaji), Bigboss, BuntirBabli, Dollar, Five Star, Jain Food (Jain Bhog), Kohinoor Diamond (Kohinoor), Lord Krishna (Kirshna), Lord Krishna Food (Krihsnabhog), MPS SSS, NL, NPS555, Love (Neha), OM, Royal (Raj), Ocean (Sagar), Goddess Laxmi (Sri Laxmi), Tricolor (Tiranga), Emperor (Badsah), Water Fountain (Panghat), The Great Goddess of Wealth Goddess Laxmi (Maha Laxmi), Heart Felt (Manpasand).

is not clear homogeneity in the quality per bag. While 48% of the same brands are reported to show no difference in quality, 38% and 13% show 'a bit' and 'a lot' of difference in quality, respectively. Further questions were then asked on the information given on the bag. In 80% of the brands, the exact weights were printed on the bags. However, most other information that typically goes with food branding was not available. Only 16% of the bags provided an expiration date. In none of the cases was the exact address of the manufacturer or the maximum retail price printed, and in only 5% of the cases a telephone number for the manufacturer was given. Thus, if a customer was not satisfied with the product, it would be hard for him to trace the product back to the company where the product was packaged. This implies that these sellers show little willingness to be accountable for the quality of their products, since clear traceability mechanisms – increasingly demanded in more sophisticated markets – are not in place.

Table 7 documents some of the costs and benefits from this branding process for wholesalers that brand and package their products. Three costs are needed in the packing and branding process, i.e. the purchase of designed bags or the design itself, packing machines, and labor for packing. Half of the wholesalers buy empty branded bags. While some of these bags are made in the production area of Darbhanga itself, the majority, 94% of the bags, however are ordered from specialized manufacturers in the cities of Kanpur or Delhi. In 18% of the cases, the design of the bag was done by the wholesaler himself. In that case, the costs of the design amount to a one time investment of Rs. 22,000. The average cost for an empty bag is Rs. 2.1. Almost half of the wholesalers (47%) report to own a packaging machine. The investment costs for such a

machine are minimal, with a reported price of Rs. 1862 (or 41 USD). The labor costs involved in filling up and the sealing of the bags amounts to Rs. 0.4 per bag.

Wholesalers were asked to evaluate the benefits from the packing and branding process. They estimated that if the products that were in the bags were sold loose, they would be able to obtain a price that is on average Rs. 15 lower than when bagged and branded.¹⁵ Based on the numbers above, this compares to total variable costs for bagging of Rs. 2.5 per bag or Rs. 10 per kg (as bags are mostly 0.25 kg) or a 50% margin to pay for the investment costs, or the initial machine and design. However, some wholesalers indicated that *makhana* products were not comparable as the quality of products that was put in the branded bags was lower and could not be sold loose, as seen below.

In the opinion of the wholesalers, branded bags do often not contain quality that is better than those products that are sold loose (Table 8). 19% of the wholesalers indicate that the quality of *makhana* in the branded bags is better, 38% evaluates the quality to be the same, and 38% think it is worse. In contrast with what could be expected of branding practices, (i.e. consistent good quality with the purpose of building a loyal clientele willing to buy the branded product), a significant number of wholesalers seem to try to hide poor quality inside their branded bags. Most of the wholesalers also indicate that the quality of the *makhana* that is used for

¹⁵ Wholesalers indicated that they use a differential price scheme where higher prices were asked from direct consumers that bought from them compared to purchases by retailers. The average price difference was about 8 Rs./bag or 32 Rs. per kg. However, direct sales to consumers are limited.

Table 7
Cost and benefits of branding, as reported by wholesalers.

	Unit	Mean or %	Median
Costs			
Branding costs:			
Design organized by			
wholesaler himself	%	18	
other	%	82	
Costs design	Rs.	22,000	25,000
Bagging costs:			
Buy empty branded bags	%	50	
Own a packing machine	%	47	
Price of packing machine	Rs.	1862	1900
City where bags are made			
Darbhanga	%	6	
Delhi	%	41	
Kanpur	%	53	
Price of empty bag	Rs./bag	2.1	2.0
Labor costs for bagging:			
Price of labor	Rs./bag	0.4	0.4
Sales prices/benefits			
Sales price to retailer	Rs./bag	40.0	38.8
Sales price to consumer	Rs./bag	47.6	47.5
Sales price to retailer	Rs./kg	157	150
Reported sales price to retailer, if same quality sold loose	Rs./kg	142	138
Willingness to pay for branded quality			
Willingness to pay for the high-cost brand quality (N = 15)	Rs./kg	179	160
Willingness to pay for the low-cost brand quality (N = 14)	Rs./kg	163	163
t-Test	t-Value	-1.43	
	Pr (T < t)	0.08	
	Pr(T > t)	0.16	

inclusion in the bags can come from all types of suppliers (58%) and inclusion in the bag does not depend on specific characteristics of suppliers. There are thus seemingly little exclusion effects from branding, which sometimes has been found in other modernizing markets (Reardon et al., 2009).

Wholesalers were further questioned on why they do not sell more branded products. The major reason is seemingly that a large number of customers like to check the quality of the product and they cannot do this with the packed product. The lack of demand for branded product does not seem related to the higher prices that are asked for branded products (5% of wholesalers), the longer time required to sell branded products (11% of wholesalers), and the lack of availability of sufficient quality to be included in branded bags (6% of wholesalers).

Branding is a complex process which aims at creating a unique name and image for a product in the consumers' mind. However, none of the wholesalers that produce the branded bags employ salesmen to sell their brand, and none of them pay for ads on television, on the radio, or in the newspaper. It seems that the only way that these wholesalers communicate the superiority of their branded products to potentially loyal consumers is through the information that is printed on their bags and consumers' experience of the product itself.

High-priced brands

A different packing and branding system has been put in place by Shakti Sudha Industries which has received positive press coverage.¹⁶ This will be called the high-price brand hence forward. This firm which started in 2004 implemented a new business model opening up new market opportunities for the *makhana* product. While the best quality of *makhana* (*lava*) is branded and sold in export markets or in big cities, the lower qualities are processed into

new products, such as roasted snack foods, flakes, or powder for pudding. Until recently these products did not exist in the market place. To sell the branded products, the company employs 24 sales persons in the country and it spends monthly on average 1 million Rs. (22,000 USD) for ads on TV, radio and in newspapers. The reported quantities of popped *makhana* sold by the company have increased from 124 tons in 2005 to 3000 tons in 2009. In 2009, 40% was sold in export markets (mostly to Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, and the Middle East; no processed products were exported) while the rest was being sold in local markets all over India (30% sold as processed products and 70% in natural form). Little is sold to the local markets in Bihar as they feel there is no quality demand and there are no quality rewards in these local markets.

Shakti Sudha Industries implemented a procurement system that supposedly benefits the farmers in four ways.¹⁷ First, they assure a fixed floor price at 100 Rs./kg for *makhana* pop for all farmers that own the membership card *khet se bazaar tak*¹⁸ of the company. A different price is implemented every month in line with market prices, but the offered farm prices are assured to never drop lower than the floor price. The prices offered are also further guaranteed to raise steadily over the season or around 5 Rs./kg rise per month, protecting farmers from potential downward price volatility. Farmers are paid within 3 days of delivery in their account. Second, farmers are linked to the banking system as they are required by the company to set up a banking account. They will help farmers get access to the *Kisan Credit Card* scheme, a successful government intervention that allows farmers access to (cheap) credit. Third, farmers do not have to bear the cost of transportation because the firm reimburses them for all produce that is transported from farmers' fields to collection centers. Fourth, Shakti Sudha Industries facilitate the leasing arrangements between cultivators and owners of ponds (mostly by linking the owners of ponds to potential cultivators and writing the contracts).

However, despite a large number of interactions with Shakti Sudha Industries and key informants in several of their supposed

¹⁶ Business Outlook, a leading Indian business magazine, has chosen it one of the 14 best agricultural innovations in the country (<http://business.outlookindia.com/inner.aspx?articleid=2165&editionid=58&catid=2&subcatid=973>).

¹⁷ See <<http://www.shaktisudha.com/about.html>>.

¹⁸ Translated "Farm to Market".