



***The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library***

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

## COMMENT: PRICING POLICY IN PRICE SENSITIVITY, INTERDEP. INCOME

MB Elliott

*Senior Economist, Maize Board, Pretoria*

In a series of previous articles Van Zyl (1990) and Davel (1990) debated the pricing policy of the Maize Board for both white and yellow maize. Whilst it is agreed that elasticities are only one of a series of factors in the marketing milieu, recent research findings shed more light on the subject and need to be taken into account. The results pertain to white maize for human consumption.

It has been established that 94 per cent of the maize meal produced in the RSA is consumed by the Black population group (Elliott, 1991). To base income and price elasticity estimates on the total South African population is therefore erroneous. Past income and findings on price elasticities of demand may therefore be questioned.

Amongst the Black population alone there are four main linguistic groupings, with a number of subdivisions in each group. Regional differences are common in the market for white maize products. Regional estimates of income elasticity of demand for maize meal for Blacks support this premise by exhibiting substantial regional differences. Country-wide generalisations are therefore dangerous.

It was established that for Blacks, maize meal in general is a normal product and not an inferior product as previously believed. Van Zyl (1986) estimated the income elasticity for whole white maize at -0,30. This estimate was for the total population based on data at the wholesale level. No previous estimates were available for maize meal at the retail level. Analysis of Bureau of Marketing Research data for 15 000 Black households revealed that for urban regions in 1985 the income elasticity for maize meal was 0,0610 and for all maize products it was 0,0474. Rural areas showed income elasticities of 0,1961 for maize meal and 0,1471 for maize products. Lipsey (1979) describes this type of product as being a normal good, that is income inelastic. With such a product the quantity demanded increases as income increases but less than in proportion to the increase in income. Indications are that maize meal, in general, is a normal product and as such will perform more favourably in future under a positive economic scenario than one of poor growth.


Certain other specific areas such as the PWV region, do however indicate the reverse to be true, i.e. that maize meal is an inferior good. This highlights the point about regional differences and sweeping generalisations being dangerous.

Groenewald (1991) and Nieuwoudt (1973) highlighted the limitations of data sources within the RSA. Published macro data should be handled with caution. Bar code scanning has been one of the first uncorrupted sources of data which has enabled a true fix on price elasticity at the retail level.

Estimates, based on bar code scanning data collected in urban regions, of price elasticities of demand for maize meal at the retail level generated for urban regions, indicate maize meal to be more price sensitive than previously believed. The price elasticity of demand for maize meal in urban regions was estimated at -0,69 (Elliott and Van Zyl, 1991). This is not comparable to that estimated by Van Zyl (1986) who estimated the price elasticity of demand for white maize for human consumption.

Price and income changes are causally related in terms of the reactions of an individual. For example, a substantial price increase on a normal product which forms a reasonably large portion of the Black's budget is equivalent to a reduction in income, with the corresponding reduction in consumption. In other words, if market expansion was a priority before 1987, the policy for pricing white maize was contrary to this end.

Figure 2 shows other results of bar code scanning data for urban supermarkets, which according to other research estimates represents between 18 per cent and 28 per cent of the urban maize sales. Here the relative price of maize meal is plotted against the market share that maize meal holds in the urban supermarket sector. The relative price of maize meal is the price of maize meal divided by the sum of the prices of the most important sources of carbohydrate (bread, rice, potatoes, instant cereals and maize meal). Once again a more price sensitive relationship is displayed.



Source: Elliott and Van Zyl (1991)

Figure 2: The relative maize meal price versus market share