

An Analytical Study of the Marketing Margin of Broiler Chicken in Baghdad Governorate 2024

Alaa Abdalkareem Jayan*

Researcher

University of Baghdad / College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences / Department of
Agricultural Economics

alaa.abdl2308m@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Qais. T. Jasam**

Prof. (Ph.D(.

University of Baghdad / College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences / Department of
Agricultural Economics

Qais.T@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

The marketing margin is an important economic indicator that measures the efficiency of agricultural product marketing systems by analyzing the distribution of returns among producers, intermediaries, and consumers. It represents the difference between the product price in the market and its farm-level price, including costs such as transportation, storage, packaging, and profits along the marketing chain. Several methods are used to measure the marketing margin, including the absolute margin (monetary price difference) and the relative margin (percentage of the selling price), as well as the price spread indicator that reveals the distribution of costs and profits at each marketing stage. The results showed significant variation in marketing margins among different parties (slaughterhouses, wholesalers, retailers), indicating disparities in marketing efficiency influenced by factors such as transportation and storage costs and monopolistic practices—such as price manipulation by dominant intermediaries or the restriction of market access for certain producers—that negatively affect fair distribution of returns. There was also observed loss in marketed quantities between slaughterhouses and wholesalers due to poor packing, transportation, and refrigeration, which reduces economic returns. Recommendations include supporting agricultural cooperatives to reduce the role of intermediaries, improving packing and transport practices, using proper refrigeration methods, providing periodic pricing data, and raising awareness among producers and traders to improve product quality and market value.

Keywords: marketing margin, Absolute Marketing Margin, marketing chain, Relative Marketing Margin, Price Spread .

INTRODUCTION

The marketing margin is considered one of the vital economic indicators in evaluating the efficiency of agricultural marketing systems, given its important role in analyzing the distribution of returns among the active participants in the agri-food supply chain. The gross agricultural marketing margin is defined as the portion of consumer expenditure that is not transferred directly to the producer (farmer), but is instead distributed among various marketing institutions responsible for delivering the product from the farm to the final consumer (3). This margin includes the costs of marketing services such as transportation, storage, packaging, and refrigeration as well as the profits earned by these institutions in return for their functions (4). (This margin, typically measured as the difference between the retail price of an agricultural product and its corresponding value at the farm level, serves as a fundamental indicator reflecting the efficiency of the marketing system and the fairness of revenue distribution among producers, intermediaries, and consumers. Moreover, it helps clarify the nature of the relationship between the final price of the product and the series of costs and returns involved in marketing it, making it a powerful analytical tool for both economic policymakers and researchers)2.(

The importance of analyzing marketing margins is heightened in light of the widening gap between prices at the production and consumption levels, which raises critical questions about equity in distribution and the efficiency of marketing systems (8). This margin is influenced by several factors, including the number of marketing stages the product goes through, the costs of operations such as transport, storage, and refrigeration, as well as geographic disparities in living

standards, which affect retail pricing and profit margins especially at the final retail stage (1.(

In the context of poultry meat marketing, particularly broiler chicken, these issues become even more relevant. Poultry is considered a primary source of animal protein for many consumers due to its affordability and nutritional value, which increases demand across various population segments. However, the marketing process of broiler chicken often involves multiple intermediaries—from farm, to slaughterhouse, to wholesale markets, and finally to retail outlets—each stage adding costs and influencing the final price. Inefficiencies or imbalances in this chain can significantly impact both the profitability of poultry farmers and the affordability for consumers. Therefore, studying the marketing margin in the poultry sector provides critical insights into how value is distributed, identifies potential bottlenecks, and helps design more equitable and efficient marketing strategies that serve both ends of the supply chain. Accordingly, studying the marketing margin provides a deeper understanding of the realities of agricultural product marketing and offers a scientific foundation for developing marketing policies that contribute to improving producer incomes, reducing consumer costs, and enhancing overall market efficiency (20.(

Materials and Methods:

Marketing margins consist of the costs incurred from various operations and services related to marketing activities, such as transportation, storage, sorting, grading, packaging, aggregation, and sales operations whether wholesale or retail in addition to the profits and wages earned by intermediaries at

different stages of the marketing chain (16). Marketing margins can be classified into several main types, the most notable of which are as follows:

Absolute Marketing Margin

This refers to the difference between the selling price and the purchase price, expressed in monetary units. It is represented by the following equation: (6)

$$\text{Absolute Marketing Margin} = \text{Selling Price} - \text{Purchase Price} \quad (1)$$

Relative Marketing Margin

This represents the absolute marketing margin as a percentage of the selling price. It is expressed by the following formula: (5)

$$\text{Relative Marketing Margin} = \left(\frac{\text{Absolute Marketing Margin}}{\text{Selling Price}} \right) \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Price Spread

The price spread is one of the key indicators used to evaluate the efficiency of a marketing system. It refers to the difference between the price paid by the final consumer for an agricultural product and the price received by the producer (farmer) for an equivalent quantity of the same product. The price spread is usually calculated on a monthly or yearly basis and applied to specific quantities and types of food products. It serves as an analytical tool for multiple purposes (10), such as: (12)(19)(21)

Identifying the share of each marketing stage (e.g., transport, storage, distribution) in the final price paid by the consumer.

Analyzing the composition of prices and the distribution of profits among producers, intermediaries, and distributors. The price spread includes several elements, such as:

Intermediaries profits

Labor and transportation costs

Changes in packaging and presentation

Other marketing-related activities

Changes in the value of the price spread reflect variations in the level of costs or profits across different links in the marketing chain or a combination of both. As such, it is considered a critical analytical tool for marketing policies and for improving the economic performance of agricultural supply chains (9).

Methods for Measuring the Marketing Margin

There are several traditional methods and approaches used to identify the marketing margin for agricultural goods and products. The most prominent among them include the following:

The Marketing Bill

The marketing bill represents the difference between the total amount consumers pay for agricultural products and the amount received by producers for equivalent quantities of those products at the farm level. It reflects the overall cost of marketing in terms of services, transportation, distribution, and profits throughout the supply chain (18).

Market Basket Approach

This method relies on tracking consumer purchasing patterns for locally produced goods sold in grocery stores over a specific period—typically three years. Through this approach, the relative weight of each product in the basket is determined, allowing for the comparison of consumer prices with the equivalent farm-level prices. Consequently, the marketing margin for each product within the basket can be estimated (11).

Value Added

Value added is defined as the incremental increase in value that results from the production or marketing process. It is calculated by subtracting the cost of inputs and services used (such as raw materials and marketing services) from the market value of the final products. In the agricultural context, value added refers to the total return generated from the use of capital and labor on the farm, after deducting the cost of production inputs and services provided by non-agricultural sectors(7). It represents the net economic value created by agricultural activity through transforming raw materials into higher market-value products. Additionally, value added is a crucial indicator for analyzing the contribution of the agricultural sector to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and is used to understand how consumer spending on non-food agricultural products is distributed along the marketing chain from the farm to the final consumer (17 .(

Farmer's Share of Consumer Expenditures

The farmer's share of consumer expenditures is one of the most important indicators used in analyzing the marketing margin. It provides a direct measure of the extent to which the agricultural producer benefits from the value paid by the final consumer (13). This share is calculated as a percentage representing the portion received by the farmer from the total amount paid by the consumer to purchase the product. The higher the farmer's share, The lower the marketing margin, indicating greater efficiency in the performance of the marketing system and reduced costs and profits for intermediaries and marketing institutions. This indicator is based on the concept of the marketing margin, which is defined as the difference between derived demand (which reflects the relationship between price and quantity at the farm gate or wholesale level) and final demand, which reflects consumer response in the retail market (15.(

Results and Discussion:

Table (1) shows Absolute Marketing Margin for Broiler Meat: Slaughterhouse Traders – Wholesale Traders The results presented regarding the calculation of the absolute marketing margin show a clear variation in values across the studied marketing cases. The highest absolute marketing margin was recorded at 1,250,000 IQD in Form No. (24), indicating a significant gap between the slaughterhouse purchase price and the wholesale selling price. This reflects low marketing efficiency in that case, possibly due to high transportation, storage, and commission costs, or due to monopolistic practices or control exerted by certain intermediaries over the marketing chains.

Conversely, the lowest recorded absolute marketing margin was 40,000 IQD in Form No. (42), representing a case of high marketing efficiency or direct selling from the slaughterhouse to the wholesaler, where intermediary costs are minimal and prices are lower, thereby improving returns for producers. The average absolute marketing margin across all cases was 707,162.90 IQD, which represents approximately 24% of the average selling price of 3,644,338.71 IQD. This indicates that a significant portion of the final price structure consists of marketing costs. Some of these costs may be justified (e.g., transport and storage), while others suggest inefficiencies or unfair distribution of returns between producers and intermediaries. The considerable disparity in absolute marketing margin values across different cases highlights a structural imbalance in market organization and the absence of effective mechanisms to regulate the marketing chain. This calls for efforts to improve marketing infrastructure, strengthen the role of agricultural cooperatives, and limit intermediary exploitation—thus contributing to a more equitable distribution of returns and improved marketing efficiency .

Table (1) Total Absolute Marketing Margin for Broiler Meat Trader – Study Sample

Absolute Marg	Selling Price	Purchase Price	Form	Absolute Margin	Selling Price	Purchase Price	Form	Absolute	Selling Price	Purchase Price	Form
310000	4300000	3150000	43	850000	4100000	3450000	22	650000	3900000	2250000	1
330000	3780000	2980000	44	580000	3900000	3320000	23	837500	3940000	3102500	2
700000	3400000	2700000	45	1250000	3960000	2700000	24	950000	3950000	2000000	3
750000	3200000	2450000	46	800000	3900000	3100000	25	600000	3100000	2500000	4
760000	3800000	2840000	47	570000	2970000	2400000	26	800000	4500000	3700000	5
420000	3100000	2600000	48	500000	3500000	3000000	27	500000	4500000	4000000	6
434800	3021000	2586400	49	1100000	3900000	2800000	28	600000	4100000	3500000	7
550000	3451000	2851000	50	700000	3500000	2800000	29	800000	3800000	3100000	8
853000	3500000	2847000	51	800000	3500000	2900000	30	900000	2850000	1950000	9
891000	3841000	2850000	52	800000	4100000	3500000	31	600000	3500000	2900000	10
870000	3480000	2780000	53	700000	3500000	2800000	32	700000	2450000	1750000	11
888000	3480000	2585000	54	800000	3700000	3100000	33	600000	4100000	3500000	12
870000	3850000	2780000	55	850000	3900000	3250000	34	850000	3750000	2900000	13
770000	3880000	3120000	56	800000	4000000	3200000	35	700000	3850000	2950000	14
800000	3780000	2980000	57	750000	3850000	3100000	36	550000	4000000	3450000	15
950000	3845000	2895000	58	900000	3900000	3000000	37	800000	3500000	2700000	16
860000	4380000	3520000	59	850000	3150000	2500000	38	500000	4300000	3800000	17
700000	4180000	3480000	60	800000	3500000	2700000	39	500000	3500000	3000000	18
750000	4380000	3800000	61	440000	3800000	3180000	40	600000	3800000	3000000	19
887000	4385000	3458000	62	400000	2900000	2500000	41	750000	3900000	2850000	20
				808000	3428000	2820000	42	550000	2850000	2300000	21
707162.9032				Average Absolute Margin	364438.71	Average Selling Price	3597275.806	Average Purchase Price			

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

As shown in Table (2), Absolute Marketing Margin for Wholesale – Retail Chicken Meat Dealers According to Table the data presented vital figures related to purchase and selling operations, as well as the absolute marketing margin for local chicken meat in Baghdad province. It was found that the highest absolute marketing margin was recorded in sequence number (3), reaching 1,035,000 IQD. This increase may be attributed to the wholesaler selling large batches or specific breeds and weights of chicken with high-profit margins. Moreover, changes in purchase and selling prices are not fixed and depend on market supply and demand — such as oversupply during peak production times or increased demand during occasions like holidays. The table also showed that the lowest absolute marketing margin was recorded in sequence number (55), amounting to 301,000 IQD only — the lowest among all values. This likely indicates a small price gap between the wholesaler and retailer, possibly due to the retailer's limited ability to impose higher prices. It may also be attributed to the specific geographic location of the trader and the decreased demand in that situation. Based on

the full quantitative data, the average absolute marketing margin was found to be approximately 615,204.83 IQD, representing the average gross profit (before deducting operational costs such as transportation, electricity, labor, and rent). This value reflects the average difference between the retailer's selling price and the purchase price. The table revealed that the selling prices (to the consumer) were higher than the purchase prices, indicating high demand for local chicken in the study sample. This average can be used as a benchmark to compare marketing performance efficiency across different provinces or time periods. Continued success in this area requires the development of marketing plans and strategies that highlight the local product's value and respond effectively to consumer needs.

As shown in Table (2), Absolute Marketing Margin for Wholesale – Retail Chicken Meat Dealers According to Table the data presented vital figures related to purchase and selling operations, as well as the absolute marketing margin for local chicken meat in Baghdad province. It was found that the highest absolute marketing margin was recorded in sequence number (3), reaching 1,035,000 IQD

This increase may be attributed to the wholesaler selling large batches or specific breeds and weights of chicken with high-profit margins. Moreover, changes in purchase and selling prices are not fixed and depend on The table also showed that the lowest absolute marketing margin was recorded in sequence number (55), amounting to 301,000 IQD only — the lowest among all values. This likely indicates a small price gap between the wholesaler and retailer, possibly due to the retailer's limited ability to impose higher prices. It may also be attributed to the specific geographic location of the trader and the decreased demand in that situation. Based on the full quantitative data, the average absolute marketing margin was found to be approximately 615,204.83 IQD, representing the average gross profit (before deducting operational costs such as transportation, electricity, labor, and rent). This value reflects

market supply and demand — such as oversupply during peak production times or increased demand during occasions like holidays.

the average difference between the retailer's selling price and the purchase price. The table revealed that the selling prices (to the consumer) were higher than the purchase prices, indicating high demand for local chicken in the study sample. This average can be used as a benchmark to compare marketing performance efficiency across different provinces or time periods .

Continued success in this area requires the development of marketing plans and strategies that highlight the local product's value and respond effectively to consumer needs.

Table (2) Absolute Marketing Margin for Wholesale-Retail Chicken Meat Dealer

Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Purchase Price	Sequence	Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Purchase Price	Sequence	Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Purchase Price	Sequence
656000	4656000	4000000	43	468000	4568000	4100000	22	950000	3850000	2900000	1
345000	4125000	3780000	44	586000	4486000	3900000	23	640000	4580000	3940000	2
552000	3952000	3400000	45	435000	4385000	3950000	24	835000	3785000	2950000	3
364000	3564000	3200000	46	588000	4488000	3900000	25	1055000	4155000	3100000	4
425000	4025000	3600000	47	676000	3646000	2970000	26	485000	4985000	4500000	5
680000	3780000	3100000	48	626000	4126000	3500000	27	500000	5000000	4500000	6
679000	3700000	3021000	49	589000	4489000	3900000	28	685000	4785000	4100000	7
536000	3987000	3451000	50	756000	4256000	3500000	29	782000	4682000	3900000	8
600000	4100000	3500000	51	686000	4186000	3500000	30	898000	3748000	2850000	9
384000	4025000	3641000	52	680000	4780000	4100000	31	683000	4183000	3500000	10
512000	3962000	3450000	53	480000	3980000	3500000	32	1018000	3468000	2450000	11
536000	3986000	3450000	54	656000	4356000	3700000	33	555000	4655000	4100000	12
302000	3951000	3650000	55	679000	4578000	3900000	34	538000	4288000	3750000	13
495000	4325000	3890000	56	690000	4698000	4000000	35	475000	4125000	3650000	14
582000	4362000	3780000	57	401500	4251500	3850000	36	658000	4658000	4000000	15
620000	4465000	3845000	58	668000	4568000	3900000	37	785000	4285000	3500000	16
800000	4850000	4050000	59	634700	3784700	3150000	38	552000	4852000	4300000	17
782500	4932500	4150000	60	475000	3975000	3500000	39	658000	4158000	3500000	18
670000	5020000	4350000	61	450000	4050000	3600000	40	400000	4000000	3600000	19
634000	4989000	4355000	62	741000	3641000	2900000	41	528000	4128000	3600000	20
				563000	3989000	3426000	42	834000	3684000	2850000	21
615204.8387	Average Absolute Margin	4259543.548	Average Consumer Price	3644338.71	Average Purchase Price						

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Table (3) show Total Absolute Marketing Margin for Wholesale Chicken Meat Dealers in the Study Sample Table provides an in-depth insight into the profit structure of chicken meat dealers in Baghdad, highlighting

the relationship between the purchase price (from the farm) and the selling price to the retailer, and presenting the absolute marketing margin for each transaction, along with averages that offer indicators of the sector's overall performance .

The average total absolute marketing margin was 1,322,368 IQD, reflecting a significant financial return. The data also shows that retailers heavily rely on wholesalers for their chicken supply, giving wholesalers substantial pricing power. Results showed a wide variation among traders, with the highest margin recorded at 1,798,000 IQD in trader form No. (9), and the lowest margin at 890,000 IQD in form No. (40). This variation may be attributed to several factors, including changes in farm purchase prices, fluctuations

in retail selling prices, sales volumes, and relationships between traders and farm owners. Traders with strong relationships may benefit from better purchase prices and a consistent flow of goods sold at favorable rates. The table data indicates that the market offers opportunities for profit, but understanding market dynamics such as supply and demand and careful management of costs and pricing is essential for success.

Table (3) Total Absolute Marketing Margin for Chicken Meat Dealer – Study Sample

Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Slaughterhouse Price	Serial	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Slaughterhouse Price	Serial	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Slaughterhouse Price	Serial
1466000	485000	3190000	43	1118000	458000	3450000	22	1600000	385000	2250000	1
1175000	4125000	2950000	44	1569000	448000	3520000	23	1477500	4680000	3102500	2
1252000	3852000	2700000	45	1655000	4385000	2700000	24	1785000	3785000	2000000	3
1114000	3564000	2450000	46	1368000	4488000	3100000	25	1655000	4155000	2500000	4
1185000	4025000	2840000	47	1248000	3645000	2400000	26	1285000	4885000	3700000	5
1100000	3780000	2680000	48	1128000	4125000	3000000	27	1000000	5000000	4000000	6
1113600	3700000	2586400	49	1689000	4489000	2800000	28	1285000	4785000	3500000	7
1096000	3887000	2891000	50	1454000	4154000	2800000	29	1582000	4652000	3100000	8
1253000	4030000	2847000	51	1386000	4186000	2900000	30	1798000	3748000	1950000	9
1375000	4025000	2650000	52	1280000	4780000	3500000	31	1283000	4153000	2900000	10
1182000	3862000	2780000	53	1180000	3980000	2800000	32	1718000	3488000	1750000	11
1421000	3886000	2565000	54	1258000	4358000	3100000	33	1155000	4655000	3500000	12
1171000	3851000	2780000	55	1318000	4578000	3250000	34	1388000	4288000	2900000	13
1205000	4325000	3120000	56	1488000	4688000	3200000	35	1175000	4115000	2950000	14
1362000	4962000	3680000	57	1151500	4251500	3100000	36	1208000	4658000	3450000	15
1570000	4465000	2895000	58	1568000	4568000	3000000	37	1585000	4285000	2700000	16
1468000	4850000	3390000	59	1284700	3784700	2500000	38	1052000	4852000	3800000	17
1482500	4852500	3450000	60	1275000	3975000	2700000	39	1158000	4158000	3000000	18
1420000	5020000	3600000	61	890000	4050000	3160000	40	1000000	4000000	3000000	19
1531000	4880000	3458000	62	1142000	3641000	2500000	41	1278000	4118000	2850000	20
				1169000	3989000	2820000	42	1384000	3884000	2300000	21
1322368	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	4258544		Average Consumer Price	2097176	Average Slaughterhouse Price					

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Table (4) show Relative Marketing Margin of Chicken Meat – Slaughterhouse Dealers vs. Wholesale Dealers, The analysis of the relative marketing margin in Table focusing on the relationship between slaughterhouse dealers and wholesale dealers, revealed a noticeable variation in margin percentages across the studied cases. This reflects differences in marketing efficiency and profitability at this stage of the marketing chain. The highest relative marketing margin was recorded at 32.20% in form No. (24), indicating that slaughterhouse dealers achieved a high return compared to their purchasing cost from wholesalers. This may suggest either unjustified price increases or

weak bargaining power of wholesale dealers, potentially linked to market structure or limited competition in certain areas. On the other hand, the lowest relative margin was 11.11% in form No. (6), a low percentage that reflects intense competition in the slaughterhouse market, pushing dealers to reduce their profit margins. It also indicates high efficiency in the marketing chain, enabling the reduction of price gaps. The average relative marketing margin across all cases was 19.58%, meaning that approximately one-fifth of the product's final value goes as profit margin to the slaughterhouse dealers. This average reflects a moderately efficient stage in the marketing process. However, the wide variation among

cases suggests discrepancies in marketing performance, which may be attributed to differences in market conditions supply and

demand levels and operating costs at the slaughterhouses.

Table (4) Relative Marketing Margin of Chicken Meat for Slaughterhouse Dealers – Wholesale Dealers

Relative Margin	Absolute Margin	Selling Price	Serial	Relative Margin	Absolute Margin	Selling Price	Serial	Relative Margin	Absolute Margin	Selling Price	Serial
20.25	810000	4000000	43	15.85365854	650000	4100000	22	21.41379	600000	2800000	1
21.96787196	850000	3780000	44	14.67179487	580000	3900000	23	21.22655	837500	3940000	2
20.58823929	700000	3400000	45	31.64566962	1250000	3950000	24	31.20839	650000	2850000	3
23.4375	750000	3200000	46	20.51283081	800000	3900000	25	29.35484	600000	3100000	4
21.11111111	780000	3600000	47	19.19191919	570000	2970000	26	17.77778	800000	4500000	5
13.5485871	420000	3100000	48	14.38571429	500000	3500000	27	21.11111	500000	4500000	6
14.38596491	454600	3021000	49	28.29512821	1100000	3900000	28	14.62415	600000	4100000	7
16.21718053	580000	3451000	50	20	700000	3500000	29	20.51282	800000	3900000	8
18.65714286	650000	3500000	51	17.14285714	600000	3500000	30	31.57895	600000	2850000	9
27.21779731	991000	3640000	52	14.62414624	600000	4100000	31	17.14286	600000	3500000	10
19.42028986	670000	3450000	53	20	700000	3500000	32	28.57143	700000	2450000	11
25.65217581	885000	3450000	54	16.21621622	600000	3700000	33	14.62415	600000	4100000	12
23.63660644	870000	3650000	55	16.66666667	650000	3900000	34	21.66667	850000	3750000	13
19.79454447	770000	3890000	56	20	800000	4000000	35	29.17808	700000	3650000	14
21.16402116	800000	3780000	57	19.48051948	750000	3850000	36	13.75	550000	4000000	15
24.70740122	950000	3845000	58	13.07692308	900000	3900000	37	21.85714	800000	3500000	16
16.28619451	660000	4050000	59	20.63462063	650000	3150000	38	11.62794	500000	4300000	17
16.86748988	700000	4150000	60	21.85714286	800000	3500000	39	14.28571	500000	3500000	18
17.34237991	750000	4250000	61	12.22222222	440000	3600000	40	16.66667	600000	3600000	19
20.58700483	867000	4255000	62	13.789115345	460000	2900000	41	20.83333	750000	3600000	20
				17.6852882	808000	3428000	42	29.29815	930000	2850000	21
16.58248227	Average Relative Margin	707162.9032	Average Absolute Margin	3644388.71	Average Selling Price						

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Table 5) show Relative Marketing Margin for Wholesale Chicken Trader – Retailer provided valuable insights about chicken traders through analyzing the absolute margin and the relative marketing margin, which allows us to better understand profitability efficiency. The relative marketing margin was calculated using the formula:

$$\text{Relative Marketing Margin} = (\text{Absolute Marketing Margin}) / (\text{Consumer Price}) \times 100$$

Where the consumer price in the formula refers to the price at which the trader sells to the consumer, and the absolute marketing margin was calculated previously. The results showed that the percentage fluctuated between (7.62) as shown in Form (55) and (29.35) in Form (11). The number of traders whose

relative margins were high (more than 20%) was (10) traders .

This high percentage is attributed to the high selling price, low purchase price, efficient management in reducing waste, as well as the possibility that the trader sold a desirable type of chicken which may be of high quality or suitable weight for demand. The relative margins ranging between (10% - 20%), considered good margins, included (48) traders, which is the largest percentage in the study sample, approximately (77%) of the total sample. This reflects successful and stable commercial performance .

Finally, the weak relative marketing margins (less than 10%) represented (4) traders, a low and poor percentage. The decline is attributed to several reasons, including possible delays in sales, which increase storage costs or reduce product quality. The average absolute margin

was (14.60), the average consumer price was (4,259,543.548), and the average absolute

margin was (615,204.8387.)

Table (5) Relative Marketing Margin for Wholesale Chicken Trader – Retailer

Relative Margin	Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Serial	Relative Marketing Margin	Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Serial	Relative Marketing Margin	Absolute Margin	Consumer Price	Serial
14.09	606000	4856000	43	10.25	468000	4588000	23	24.68	950000	3850000	1
8.36	345000	4125000	44	13.06	586000	4486000	23	13.97	640000	4580000	2
13.97	552000	3952000	45	9.92	435000	4385000	34	22.06	835000	3785000	3
10.21	364000	3548000	46	13.10	588000	4488000	25	25.39	1055000	4155000	4
20.56	825000	4025000	47	18.54	676000	3646000	26	9.73	485000	4985000	5
17.99	680000	3780000	48	15.17	626000	4126000	27	10.00	500000	5000000	6
18.35	679000	3700000	49	15.13	589000	3989000	38	14.33	685000	4785000	7
13.44	538000	3987000	50	17.76	756000	4256000	29	18.70	782000	4682000	8
14.63	600000	4100000	51	16.39	686000	4186000	30	21.96	896000	3748000	9
9.54	384000	4025000	52	14.23	660000	4780000	31	16.33	685000	4185000	10
12.92	512000	3963000	53	12.06	480000	3980000	32	23.35	1018000	3468000	11
13.45	538000	3988000	54	15.06	656000	4356000	33	11.92	656000	4656000	12
7.61	301000	3951000	55	14.81	678000	4578000	34	12.55	538000	4288000	13
39.06	835000	4125000	56	14.86	680000	4698000	35	11.32	475000	4125000	14
13.34	582000	4363000	57	9.84	401500	4251500	36	14.13	658000	4658000	15
13.89	620000	4465000	58	14.62	668000	4568000	37	18.32	785000	4285000	16
16.43	800000	4850000	59	16.77	634700	3784700	38	11.38	552000	4852000	17
15.96	782500	4812500	60	11.95	475000	3975000	39	15.82	658000	4158000	18
13.55	670000	5020000	61	13.11	450000	4050000	40	10.00	400000	4000000	19
12.71	638000	4898000	62	20.33	741000	3641000	41	12.75	528000	4128000	20
				14.11	563000	3989000	42	22.64	834000	3684000	21
14.6	Relative Marketing	615204.8387	Average Absolute Margin	425843.548	Average Consumer Price						

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Through Table (6), The Overall Relative Marketing Margin for Chicken calculated using the following formula was presented:

Relative Marketing Margin = (Absolute Marketing Margin) / (Consumer Price) × 100

The highest value of the overall relative marketing margin reached (49.54) in Form No. (11). This high margin percentage may be attributed to the trader's control over the market. The lowest value of the overall

relative marketing margin was (20.00) in Form No. (6), indicating either direct product supply or market competitiveness. The average overall relative marketing margin was (31.29), meaning that one-third of the chicken price paid by the consumer is a profit margin. To increase the efficiency of the supply chain, it is necessary to reduce the gap between consumers and producers, monitor the market to prevent cases of monopoly by traders, achieve fairness in pricing, and finally, encourage cooperatives to reduce prices for consumers and increase income for producers.

Table (6) Overall Relative Marketing Margin for Chicken in the Study Sample

Marketing Margin	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Serial	Relative Marketing Margin	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Serial	Relative Marketing Margin	Total Absolute Marketing Margin	Consumer Price	Serial
31.49	1466000	4658000	43	24.47	1118000	4568000	22	41.56	1650000	3850000	1
28.48	1175000	4125000	44	25.99	1566000	4486000	23	32.26	1477500	4580000	2
31.68	1252000	3952000	45	36.43	1885000	4385000	24	47.16	1785000	3785000	3
31.26	1114000	3564000	46	30.93	1388000	4488000	25	39.83	1655000	4155000	4
29.44	1185000	4025000	47	34.17	1246000	3646000	26	25.78	1285000	4985000	5
29.30	1100000	3780000	48	27.29	1126000	4126000	27	20.00	1000000	5000000	6
30.33	1113600	3700000	49	37.63	1689000	4489000	28	36.85	1285000	4785000	7
27.49	1096000	3987000	50	34.21	1456000	4256000	29	33.79	1582000	4682000	8
30.56	1253000	4100000	51	30.72	1286000	4186000	30	47.97	1798000	3748000	9
34.16	1375000	4025000	52	26.78	1280000	4780000	31	30.67	1283000	4183000	10
29.83	1182000	3962000	53	29.65	1180000	3980000	32	49.54	1718000	3468000	11
35.65	1421000	3986000	54	28.83	1256000	4356000	33	34.81	1155000	4655000	12
29.64	1171000	3951000	55	29.01	1318000	4578000	34	32.37	1388000	4288000	13
27.86	1105000	4325000	56	31.89	1498000	4698000	35	38.48	1175000	4125000	14
31.68	1382000	4362000	57	27.08	1251500	4251500	36	25.93	1208000	4658000	15
35.16	1570000	4465000	58	34.33	1568000	4568000	37	36.99	1585000	4285000	16
30.33	1460000	4850000	59	33.94	1284700	3784700	38	21.68	1052000	4852000	17
30.06	1482500	4932500	60	31.08	1275000	3975000	39	27.85	1158000	4158000	18
28.29	1420000	5020000	61	21.98	880000	4050000	40	25.00	1200000	4000000	19
30.69	1531000	4989000	62	31.34	1543000	3643000	41	30.96	1278000	4128000	20
				29.31	1369000	3989000	42	37.57	1384000	3684000	21
31.29	Average Relative Marketing Margin	1322248	Average Total Absolute Margin	425843.548	Average Consumer Price						

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Distribution of Average Marketing Shares for the Slaughterhouse, Wholesale Trader, and Retail Trader from the Consumer Dinar:

Average Producer's Share from the Consumer Dinar

Average Producer's Share from Consumer's Dinar

$$)=\text{Average Farm Price }/(\text{Average Consumer Price})\times 100$$

Average Wholesale Trader's Share from the Consumer Dinar

Average Wholesaler's Share from Consumer's Dinar

$$)=\text{Average Wholesale Price} - \text{Average Farm Price})/(\text{Average Retail Price})\times 100$$

Average Retail Trader's Share from the Consumer Dinar

The results of Table (7) related to the loss percentage in the stage between the This loss leads to a reduction in the quantity available for sale, thereby decreasing the economic returns for both producers and marketers. Therefore, it is recommended to

slaughterhouse and the wholesale trader, based on data from a questionnaire that included (62) items, showed that the average quantity of loss amounted to approximately (56,211.06) units, while the average loss percentage reached (1.435%) of the total marketed quantities. This percentage indicates a tangible loss during the marketing process between these two stages, representing a form of indirect economic waste.

The loss volume varies among the sample items from (0%) up to (6%), reflecting differences in the efficiency of handling, transportation, and storage management between slaughterhouses and traders. Among the main reasons for this loss are weak packing and packaging operations, poor transportation means, and insufficient application of cooling or hygiene standards .

$$)=\text{Average Wholesale Price} - \text{Average Farm Price})/(\text{Average Retail Price})\times 100$$

adopt effective technical and administrative strategies to reduce loss and improve marketing performance efficiency at this stage.

Table (7) Loss Percentage

Loss Rate	Cost of Loss	Sequence	Loss Rate	Cost of Loss	Sequence	Loss Rate	Cost of Loss	Sequence
0.03	124410	43	0.03	207000	22	0	0	1
0.06	548700	44	0	0	23	0.01	6825.5	2
0.02	43200	45	0.02	12150	24	0	0	3
0.01	14700	46	0.02	9300	25	0.02	250000	4
0.01	5680	47	0.01	2400	26	0.02	111000	5
0	0	48	0	0	27	0.03	162000	6
0	0	49	0.01	4200	28	0	0	7
0.05	57820	50	0.02	8400	29	0.01	27900	8
0.02	28470	51	0.02	58000	30	0.02	29250	9
0.01	26500	52	0.01	70000	31	0.01	4350	10
0	0	53	0.02	56000	32	0.01	13125	11
0	0	54	0.01	31000	33	0.02	105000	12
0.03	25020	55	0.03	87750	34	0.02	145000	13
0.01	3120	56	0.01	24000	35	0.05	663750	14
0.01	59600	57	0.01	31000	36	0.01	25875	15
0.02	34740	58	0.03	85500	37	0.03	56700	16
0	0	59	0.01	25000	38	0.01	57000	17
0.02	55200	60	0.02	16200	39	0	0	18
0.01	18000	61	0	0	40	0	0	19
0	0	62	0	0	41	0.02	42750	20
			0	0	42	0.01	11500	21
1.435483871	Average Loss Percentage	56211.06	Average Loss Cost					

Source: Collected by the researcher based on the questionnaire form

Conclusions

.1

The results revealed significant variation in absolute marketing margin values across different marketing stages from slaughterhouse to retail, indicating substantial differences in marketing efficiency. These variations reflect the impact of transportation, storage, commission costs, and possible monopolistic practices that negatively affect market efficiency.

.2 The average absolute marketing margin represents a considerable portion of the final selling price, ranging from approximately 24% to 31%. This indicates that a large part of the final price goes to cover marketing costs, some of which are justified, while others highlight inefficiencies and unfair distribution of returns between producers and intermediaries.

Recommendations

.1

Support cooperatives to play a more active role in marketing agricultural products, thereby reducing reliance on intermediaries and narrowing price gaps .

.2 Conduct training programs for workers in packing, transportation, and storage to apply best practices in packaging, refrigeration, and hygiene.

.3 The wide disparity among traders in both absolute and relative marketing margins reflects weak structural organization of the marketing chain and lack of effective regulatory mechanisms to prevent intermediary exploitation. This calls for strengthening the role of regulatory bodies and agricultural cooperatives.

.4 The loss percentage from the slaughterhouse to the wholesale trader reached about 1.44% of marketed quantities, indicating tangible losses caused by poor packing, inadequate transportation means, and insufficient application of cooling and hygiene standards.

.3 Encourage the use of suitable and refrigerated transportation means to maintain product quality.

.4 Provide periodic data on prices at various marketing stages to ensure clear knowledge for producers, traders, and consumers.

.5 Raise awareness among producers and traders about the importance of improving

product quality and increasing market value.

References

.1

Abad, A., Abdul Muqet Maaz, M., & Salman Shamsi, M. (2024). A new method for assessing the marketing efficiency of agricultural marketing channels. In 143-journal.com (Vol. 10, Issue 2). <https://are-journal.com>.

.2 Ali, K. I., Mohamed, M. I., and Fadel, M. M. (2021). Local marketing of table eggs produced from farms in Egypt. Journal of Agricultural Economics and Social Sciences, Vol. 12.

.3 Al-Zughbi, A. (2006). Principles of Agricultural Marketing. 1st ed. Dar Al-Hamed for Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan.

.4 Thamer, G. H. (2013). Marketing efficiency of vegetable crops in Al-Anbar Governorate – Case study. Journal of Agricultural Research, Kafr El-Sheikh University, Egypt. No. 39(4): 462–472.

.5 Al-Tarawneh, S. Y. (2010). Principles of Agricultural Marketing. Dar Ward Al-Urduniya for Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan.

.6 Al-Diwaji, A. S., and Al-Huneiti, D. A. R. (2002). Agricultural Marketing. College of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Mosul.

.7 Al-Shammari, S. T. (2024). Economic analysis of production and marketing of dates in Karbala Governorate for the 2021 production season. College of Agriculture, Tikrit University.

.8 Al-Atabi, R. E. and A. J. Alwan,. (2009). Econom-ic study to measure the efficiency of mar-keting maize crop in the province of wasit to the season of agricultural

2008 . Iraqi Journal for Economic Sciences . vol 2 .PP:117 –124.

.9 AL-Tarawna,S.Y.(2010).Principles of Agricultural Marketing . House Ward Jordanian for publishing and distribution Amman – Jordan . vol 1 . P:85

.10 Al-Bakri, T. Y. (2002). Marketing Management. Baghdad: University House for Printing and Publishing.

.11 Al-Dabbagh, J. M. J. (2014). Economics of Agricultural Marketing. Baghdad, Republic of Iraq: Dar Al-Murtadha for Publishing, p. 727.

.12 Richard L. Kohls & Joseph N. Uhi: Marketing Of Agricultural Products, Fifth Edition, Macmillan Publishing company, New York, USA, 1980.

.13 Czinkota.M.R , L.A.Rankainen , (2007) , Global pricing International Marketing , Southern Westren Cengage Learning , Canada , 9ed , PP:541.

.14 Abbott .J. C,and Makehan . J.P , (1981) , Agricultural Economics and Marketing in the Tropics, Bangladih. 2ed , PP:546.

.15 Al-Diwaji, A. S. and Al-Huneiti, D. A. R. (2003). Agricultural Marketing: Concepts and Foundations. 1st ed., Dar Hamed for Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan.

.16 Koval, O., Nabareseh, S., Chromjakova, F., & Marciniak, R. (2018). Can continuous improvement lead to satisfied customers? Evidence from the services industry. The TQM Journal, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-02-2018-0021>.

.17 Thallaj, A. A. and Abdul-Qader, A. A. (2012). An economic study to show the impact of risk and its role in the marketing margin of vegetable crops in Iraq for the period (1985–2010). Bilad Al-Rafidain Journal, Vol. 2.

.18 Nasser, S. A. and Rajab, M. Z. (2017). The effect of the marketing margin of some vegetable crops on consumer prices in Baghdad Governorate in 2015. Al-Anbar Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Al-Musaib Technical Institute.

.19 Salam, M. A., Ali, M., and Abdul-Karim, M. (2004). Study of the marketing margin and marketing efficiency of apples.

Damascus University Journal for Agricultural Sciences, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 345.

.20 Jassam, Q. T. (2021). Economics of Marketing Strategic Crops in Iraq (Wheat and Barley as a Model).Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Baghdad, College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, Department of Agricultural Economics.

.21 Yassin, M. M. and Abdul-Aziz, A. M. (2003). Fundamentals of Agricultural and Food Marketing: Theoretical Part. University Publications, College of Agriculture, University of Damascus, Syria.