



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF SAND GOBY  
CAGE CULTURE IN THAILAND**

**Chatchai Pochanapan**

**FEP 1987 4**

**AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF SAND GOBY  
CAGE CULTURE IN THAILAND**

by

**Chatchai Pochanapan**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Science  
in the Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia

**JULY 1987**



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Chew Tek Ann, for devoting some of his precious time reading through my drafts and advising me on the necessary corrections. My sincere gratitude is also extended to my co-supervisor, Mr. Tai Shzee Yew, for his wise consultations and comments on an earlier draft and who was also very helpful in revising my manuscript.

My sincere gratitude is also extended to the International Development and Research Centre (IDRC) for providing me financial support. Special thanks are also due to the officers of the Department of Fisheries, Thailand and the sample of farmers for their kind cooperation in data collection.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the officers of the Division of Personnel Development and Planning of Bangkok Bank Limited for supporting my education in this Programme. My thanks are also due to Dr. Chamnian Boonma, Dr. Ruangrai Tokrisna, Dr. Sarun Wattanutchariya, Mr. Piti Kantangkul and Mr. Sanit Kuo-ian for their helpful suggestions. I would like to thank the staff of the Faculty of Economics and Management, UPM, especially Mr. Siow Kiat Foo and Mr. A. Ruthraganthan, for their warm cooperation.

*Finally, I dedicate this thesis to my family and to all of my teachers and lecturers.*

*For any misinformation, misquotation or any other errors, I hold myself solely responsible.*

Faculty of Economics and Management  
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia

Chatchai Pochanapan  
July, 1987

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page        |
|--|-------------|
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .</b>                | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .</b>               | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES . . . . .</b>                  | <b>viii</b> |
| <b>ABSTRACT (English) . . . . .</b>              | <b>xi</b>   |
| <b>ABSTRACT (Bahasa Malaysia) . . . . .</b>      | <b>xiii</b> |
| <br>   |             |
| <b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>                    | <b>1</b>    |
| Background Information . . . . .                 | 1           |
| The Fishery Sector of Thailand . . . . .         | 1           |
| Sand Goby Culture in Thailand . . . . .          | 7           |
| Statement of Problem . . . . .                   | 13          |
| Objectives of the Study . . . . .                | 16          |
| Hypotheses . . . . .                             | 17          |
| <br>   |             |
| <b>CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>            | <b>18</b>   |
| Review of Fisheries Policy in Thailand . . . . . | 18          |
| Previous Studies on Economics of Sand Goby . . . | 20          |
| Review of Profit Function Studies . . . . .      | 23          |
| <br>   |             |
| <b>CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY</b>                     | <b>27</b>   |
| Introduction . . . . .                           | 27          |
| Theoretical Framework . . . . .                  | 27          |
| Basic Theory of Production . . . . .             | 27          |

|  | Page      |
|--|-----------|
| The Concept of Profit Function . . . . .   | 30        |
| The Concept of Relative Efficiency . . . . .   | 36        |
| Empirical Model Specification . . . . .  | 38        |
| Estimation Technique . . . . .   | 43        |
| Definition of Variables . . . . .  | 44        |
| Sampling and Data Collection . . . . .   | 48        |
| Sampling Procedure and Sample Size . . . . .   | 48        |
| Data Collection . . . . .  | 51        |
| <b>CHAPTER 4 SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE AND CULTURAL PRACTICES OF SAND GOBY FARMERS . . . . .</b> | <b>52</b> |
| Characteristics of Sand Goby Farmers . . . . .   | 52        |
| Age Distribution and Education Background . . . . .  | 52        |
| Experience and Training in Sand Goby Culture . . . . .                                       | 54        |
| Occupational Background . . . . .  | 56        |
| Farm characteristics . . . . .   | 56        |
| Family Size and Economically Active Members . . . . .  | 56        |
| Farm Location . . . . .  | 59        |
| Cage Ownership and Total Cage Volume . . . . .   | 59        |
| Number of Cages and Cage Size . . . . .  | 61        |
| Type of Cage . . . . .   | 61        |
| Sand Goby Culture Practices . . . . .  | 62        |
| Cage Preparation . . . . .   | 62        |
| Stocking Practice . . . . .  | 62        |

|  | Page       |
|--|------------|
| Feeding Practices. . . . .   | 67         |
| Disease Problems and Treatment . . . . .                               | 69         |
| Harvesting and Market Outlets . . . . .                                | 71         |
| Sources of Funds . . . . .   | 74         |
| <b>CHAPTER 5 COST STRUCTURE AND RETURNS</b>                            | <b>77</b>  |
| Introduction . . . . .   | 77         |
| Costs Structure of Sand Goby Production . . . . .                      | 77         |
| Yield and Returns-Effect of Province . . . . .                         | 84         |
| Yield and Returns-Effect of Farm Size . . . . .                        | 90         |
| Yield and Returns-Effect of Experience<br>of Farmer . . . . .          | 95         |
| <b>CHAPTER 6 EMPIRICAL RESULTS</b>                                     | <b>101</b> |
| Introduction . . . . .   | 101        |
| The Results of the Profit and Factor Share<br>Functions . . . . .      | 101        |
| Tests of Hypotheses . . . . .  | 105        |
| Relative Economic Efficiency<br>Hypotheses . . . . .                   | 106        |
| Profit Maximization and Constant<br>Returns to Scale . . . . .         | 111        |
| Direct and Indirect Estimation of<br>Production Elasticities . . . . . | 112        |
| Output Supply and Factor Demand<br>Elasticities . . . . .              | 115        |
| The Supply of Output . . . . .   | 118        |
| The Demand for Variable Factors of<br>Production . . . . .             | 120        |

|   | Page       |
|---|------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 7 SUMMARY, POLICY IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH . . .</b>   | <b>123</b> |
| Introduction . . . . .  | 123        |
| Summary . . . . .   | 124        |
| Review of Literature . . . . .  | 124        |
| Methodology . . . . .   | 124        |
| Empirical Results . . . . .   | 125        |
| Policy Implications . . . . .   | 126        |
| Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .   | 128        |
| Suggestions for Further Research . . . . .  | 128        |
| <br><b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>   | <br>129    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX A Sand Goby (<u>Oxyeleotris Marmorata</u><br/>Bleeker) . . . . .</b>  | <br>134    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX B Map of Thailand showing the Principal<br/>Rivers and Sand Goby<br/>Farming Provinces . . . . .</b>  | <br>135    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX C.1 Schematics of a Typical Sand Goby<br/>Bamboo Cage . . . . .</b>   | <br>136    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX C.2 Layout and Dimensions of a Typical<br/>Sand Goby Slatted Hard-Wood Cage . . .</b>   | <br>137    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX C.3 Schematic of Sand Goby Slatted<br/>Hard-Wood Cage . . . . .</b>   | <br>138    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX D Testing the Elasticity of Substitution<br/>by Using the Constant Elasticity of<br/>Substitution (CES) Production<br/>Function . . . . .</b> | <br>139    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX E Derivation of the Cobb-Douglas<br/>Profit function . . . . .</b>  | <br>141    |
| <br><b>APPENDIX F Calculation of Feeds Price by Geometric<br/>Weighted Average Method . . . . .</b>   | <br>144    |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 1.1 Fisheries Production of Thailand from Culture and Capture, 1975-1984 . . . . .                            | 4    |
| 1.2 Number of Farms, Area, Production and Value of Inland Aquaculture in Thailand 1975-1984 . . . . .         | 5    |
| 1.3 Production, Value and Average Price of Main Species in Inland Fish Culture in Thailand, 1984 . . . . .    | 6    |
| 1.4 Sand Goby Culture Production, Amount and (Farm-Gate) Value in Thailand, 1975-1984 . . . . .               | 8    |
| 1.5 Quantity and Value of Sand Goby Export to Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore in 1977-1983 . . . . .        | 12   |
| 1.6 Number of Farms, Number of Cages and Area of Sand Goby Cage Culture in Thailand, 1981-1984 . . . . .      | 15   |
| 3.1 Means, Standard Deviations and Coefficients of Variation of Sand Goby and Variable Input Prices . . . . . | 50   |
| 4.1 Age Distribution and Education Background of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .                   | 53   |
| 4.2 Experience and Training of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .                                     | 55   |
| 4.3 Main Occupation and Reasons for Sand Goby Farming by Province, 1986 . . . . .                             | 57   |
| 4.4 Family Size and Economically Active Members of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .                 | 58   |
| 4.5 Location of Cage, Total Cage Volume, Numbers of Cages and Cage Size by Province, 1986. . . . .            | 60   |

| Table |   | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 4.6   | Type of Cage and Cage Preparation of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .   | 63   |
| 4.7   | Source and Size of Fingerlings, and Stocking Rate of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .   | 64   |
| 4.8   | Stocking Practices of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .  | 66   |
| 4.9   | Feeding Practices of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .   | 68   |
| 4.10  | Disease Problem and Treatment in Sample of Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .  | 70   |
| 4.11  | Harvesting of Sand Goby Product of Sample Farmers by Province, 1986 . . . . .   | 72   |
| 4.12  | Marketing of Sand Goby by Province, 1986 . . . . .  | 75   |
| 4.13  | Sources of Funds for Sand Goby Farming by Province, 1985 . . . . .  | 76   |
| 5.1   | Cost Structure of Sand Goby Cage Culture per Farm by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 79   |
| 5.2   | Average Cost per Cubic Meter of Cage for Various Inputs by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 80   |
| 5.3   | Average Cost per Farm for Various Inputs by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .   | 81   |
| 5.4   | Average Capital invested in Sand Goby Cage Culture per Farm by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 82   |
| 5.5   | Average Capital invested in Sand Goby Cage Culture per Cubic Meter of Cage Volume and per Kilogram of Sand Goby produced by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . . | 83   |
| 5.6   | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns for Sand Goby per Farm by Province, 1985/1986. . .  | 87   |
| 5.7   | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns per Cubic Meter of Cage by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 88   |

| Table |  | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 5.8   | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns per Kilogram of Sand Goby produced by Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 89   |
| 5.9   | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns for Sand Goby by Farm Size in Phranakhon Sriayutthaya Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .                                | 91   |
| 5.10  | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns for Sand Goby by Farm Size in Lopburi Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .  | 92   |
| 5.11  | Selected Statistics for Sand Goby Farms by Farm Size in Phranakhon Sriayutthaya and Lopburi Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .                                    | 94   |
| 5.12  | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns for Sand Goby Farms Classified by Experience in Phranakhon Sriayutthaya Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .              | 96   |
| 5.13  | Mean Values for Revenue, Cost and Returns for Sand Goby Farms Classified by Experience in Lopburi Province, 1985/1986 . . . . .                              | 97   |
| 5.14  | Selected Statistics for Sand Goby Farms Classified by Experience in Phranakhon Sriayutthaya and Lopburi province, 1985/1986 . . . . .                        | 98   |
| 6.1   | Results of the Estimated Normalized Profit Function and Factor Share Equations for Sand Goby Cage Culture in Thailand, 1985/1986 . . . . .                   | 102  |
| 6.2   | Estimated Results of Profit Function and Factor Share Equations for Sand Goby Cage Culture in Thailand with Linear Restrictions Imposed, 1985/1986 . . . . . | 108  |
| 6.3   | Test of Equal Relative Economic Efficiency, Profit Maximization and Constant Returns to Scale Hypotheses . . . . .   | 109  |
| 6.4   | Direct and Indirect Estimates of the Elasticities of Inputs . . . . .  | 113  |
| 6.5   | Elasticities of Output Supply and Factor Demand for Sand Goby Cage Culture in Thailand . . . . .   | 119  |

An abstract of the thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Pertanian Malaysia in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science.

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF SAND GOBY

CAGE CULTURE IN THAILAND

by

Chatchai Pochanapan

July, 1987

Supervisor : Chew Tek Ann, Ph. D.

Co-Supervisor : Tai Shzee Yew

Faculty : Economics and Management

Sand Goby is an important species of inland cage culture. Sand Goby has the highest average price among all the fishes. Productivity of Sand Goby cage culture seems low compared to its potential. The main focus of this study is to find ways to increase productivity of Sand Goby cage culture which could reduce per unit cost of production, leading to increased profit.

A restricted profit function is employed to estimate jointly the profit and factor demand functions using farm-level data. The relative economic efficiency (included technical and price efficiency) between small and large farms, between farmers with experience more than mean and farmers with experience less than or equal to the mean were studies. The effect of province on

economic efficiency is also analysed. The Cobb-Douglas normalized restricted profit function is specified as a function of three normalized variables (labour, fingerling and feeds), two quantities of fixed inputs (capital and volume of cages) and three dummy variables (large farms, farmers with experience more than the mean and farms in Lopburi province).

The results indicate that Sand Goby farmers maximize short-term profits and respond to price changes efficiently. There is constant returns to scale in the use of inputs. Farmers with experience more than the mean have higher economic efficiency compared to the farmers with experience less than the mean. Farmers in Lopburi also has higher economic efficiency compared to farmers in Phranakhon Sriayutthaya. There is no significant difference in economic efficiency between large and small farms. The supply elasticity of Sand Goby with respect to its own price is the highest compared to other supply elasticities.

It is recommended that Sand Goby cage culture be encouraged further in Lopburi province. Consolidation of small farms into larger-sized units would not be desirable. Furthermore, since the price of Sand Goby is the most effective in terms of affecting changes in output supply and factor demand, the price of Sand Goby would be the most powerful policy instrument available.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Pertanian Malaysia sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada syarat-syarat untuk mendapatkan ijazah Master Sains.

## ANALISIS EKONOMI PEMELIHARAAN SANGKAR

### 'SAND GOBY' DI THAILAND

oleh

Chatchai Pochanapan

July, 1987

Penyelia : Chew Tek Ann, Ph. D.

Penyelia Bersama : Tai Shzee Yew

Fakulti : Ekonomi dan Pengurusan

'Sand Goby' merupakan spesis yang penting bagi pemeliharaan bersangkar di pedalaman Thailand dan mempunyai harga purata yang tertinggi jika dibandingkan dengan harga ikan-ikan yang lain. Produktiviti pemeliharaan sangkar 'Sand Goby' didapati rendah jika dibandingkan dengan potensinya. Fokus utama kajian ini adalah bertujuan untuk mencari kaedah meninggikan produktiviti pemeliharaan sangkar 'Sand Goby' melalui pengurangan kos per unit pengeluaran supaya meninggikan keuntungan.

'Restricted Profit Function' telah digunakan untuk menganggarkan keuntungan dan fungsi permintaan faktor dengan menggunakan data dari ladang. Kajian ini juga merangkumi kecekapan ekonomi berbanding (termasuk kecekapan harga dan teknikal)

di antara ladang kecil dan ladang besar, penternak berpengalaman dengan penternak yang kurang berpengalaman dan kesan kedaerahan ke atas ekonomi juga dikaji. Fungsi Cobb-Douglas 'normalized restricted profit' adalah dispesifikasikan sebagai fungsi kepada tiga angkubah normal (buruh, 'fingerling' dan makanan), dua kuantiti input tetap (modal dan isipadu sangkar) dan tiga angkubah 'dummy' (ladang besar, penternak berpengalaman dan ladang di daerah Lopburi).

Keputusan menunjukkan penternak 'Sand Goby' memaksimakan keuntungan dalam jangkamasa pendek dan bertindak kepada perubahan harga dengan cekap serta memperolehi kadar pulangan yang konstan dalam penggunaan input. Penternak yang berpengalaman mempunyai kecekapan ekonomi yang tinggi berbanding dengan yang kurang berpengalaman. Penternak di Lopburi juga mempunyai kecekapan ekonomi yang lebih tinggi jika dibandingkan dengan penternak di Phranakhon Sriayutthaya. Keputusan juga telah menunjukkan tiada perbezaan berkesan di dalam kecekapan ekonomi di antara ladang besar dengan ladang kecil. Didapati juga keanjalan penawaran 'Sand Goby' terhadap harganya adalah tinggi berbanding dengan keanjalan-keanjalan penawaran yang lain.

Akhir sekali, adalah dicadangkan pemeliharaan 'Sand Goby' secara bersangkar digalakkan di daerah Lopburi. Menyatukan ladang kecil menjadi ladang besar adalah tidak diingini. Oleh sebab harga 'Sand Goby' adalah berkesan sekali di dalam bentuk perubahan penawaran output dan faktor permintaan, harga 'Sand Goby' adalah merupakan alat polisi yang terpenting.

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

##### **The Fishery Sector of Thailand**

The fishery sector, including aquaculture , has played a significant role in the economy of Thailand and daily life of the Thai people. From 1980 to 1984, fishery products contributed about 8.2 per cent to the real GDP. The fishery sector contributes substantially to employment and income of the people in the rural areas. Fishery product is the primary source of cheap animal protein for most of Thailand's population. Over the period from 1974 to 1983, the per capita consumption of fishery product in Thailand increased from 17.4 kilograms to 21.5 kilograms.

The contribution to Thailand's export earning by the fishery sector has increased steadily in recent years. Export earnings of fishery products increased from 1.55 billion baht in 1974 to approximately 15.08 billion baht<sup>1</sup> in 1984, at an annual rate of 17.9 per cent within this period.

The labour force of Thailand was estimated at 22.4 million in 1983, of which some 16.5 million (74 per cent) were employed in

---

1

One US\$ = 20 baht in 1975, 22 baht in 1983 and 26 baht in 1985.

the agricultural sector (including the fishery sector). The proportion of the work force employed in agriculture has declined steadily from about 82 per cent in 1960. The number of employment in the fisheries sector was estimated at 280,000 in 1982 (Asian Development Bank, 1985). Over 80 per cent (224,000) of these people were employed in marine fisheries activities, 11 per cent (29,000) in aquaculture, and nine per cent (27,000) carried out fishing in reservoirs.

Fishery production of Thailand comes from two major sources, i.e. fresh-water and marine, including brackish water. Fishery production can also be distinguished according to production from capture and production from culture. The total fisheries production in Thailand declined from 2.19 million tons in 1977 to 1.79 million tons in 1980 as a result of overfishing, water pollution and rising fuel and labour prices. A further dramatic decline in marine fish production is expected as a result of the declaration of the 200-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) by neighbouring countries.

The demand for fish in Thailand has been rising rapidly as a result of increases in population, income per capita, exports and increases in prices of alternative sources of animal protein. In order to meet these increasing demands, the government of Thailand has implemented several programmes to develop aquaculture since the third National Economic and Social Development Plan (1972-1976). This emphasis on aquaculture is due to the recognition by the government of Thailand that aquaculture production process can be controlled and enhanced through the

proper use of inputs compared to fishery production from capture which depends on natural stocks and environment. In addition, in aquaculture programmes, attempts are made to utilize more fully the available natural resources of the country. Thailand has plentiful natural resources which can be used for coastal and inland aquaculture development. Thailand has a long coastline of 2,600 km and inland water resource of about 370,000 hectares (Marr and Hongsakul, 1976). Table 1.1 shows that aquaculture production accounted on average about eight per cent of total fishery production during the years 1975 to 1984. The aquaculture production increased from 120.63 thousand tons in 1975 to 182.66 thousand tons in 1984. Average production from aquaculture during this period was 153.09 thousand tons. The average production from inland aquaculture accounted for about 25 per cent of the total production from aquaculture.

Table 1.2 shows that the number of farms, culture area, production and value of inland aquaculture have tended to increase over time during 1975-1984 period except for the years 1979 and 1982 owing to disease problems. In 1984, the production of inland aquaculture was about 50,411 tons with an approximate value of 1,226 million baht.

The commercial important species of inland culture in 1984, ranking by quantity produced were Sepat Siam, Pangasius, Tilapia, Thai Silver Carp, Snake-head, Clarias, Giant Freshwater Prawn, Common Carp, and Sand Goby. In terms of ranking by average price, the first five were Sand Goby, Giant Freshwater Prawn, Snake-head,

**TABLE 1.1**  
**FISHERIES PRODUCTION OF THAILAND FROM CULTURE  
 AND CAPTURE, 1975-1984**

| Year    | Culture             |                    |                   | Capture            |                    |                   | Total Production ('000 tons) | % of Production from Culture |
|---------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|         | Coastal ('000 tons) | Inland ('000 tons) | Total ('000 tons) | Marine ('000 tons) | Inland ('000 tons) | Total ('000 tons) |                              |                              |
| 1975    | 90.79               | 29.84              | 120.63            | 1                  | 130.85             | 1,434.67          | 1,555.30                     | 7.8                          |
| 1976    | 162.51              | 32.36              | 194.87            | 1,389.28           | 114.94             | 1,504.22          | 1,699.09                     | 11.5                         |
| 1977    | 133.27              | 33.14              | 166.41            | 1,934.27           | 89.23              | 2,023.50          | 2,189.91                     | 7.6                          |
| 1978    | 108.02              | 39.37              | 147.39            | 1,849.77           | 102.12             | 1,951.89          | 2,099.28                     | 7.0                          |
| 1979    | 100.57              | 29.46              | 130.03            | 1,712.59           | 103.71             | 1,786.30          | 1,916.33                     | 6.7                          |
| 1980    | 66.27               | 34.51              | 100.78            | 1,581.68           | 110.49             | 1,692.17          | 1,792.95                     | 5.6                          |
| 1981    | 100.67              | 48.02              | 148.69            | 1,723.77           | 166.56             | 1,840.33          | 1,989.02                     | 7.5                          |
| 1982    | 125.58              | 45.83              | 171.41            | 1,860.99           | 87.73              | 1,948.72          | 2,120.13                     | 8.1                          |
| 1983    | 121.04              | 46.97              | 168.01            | 1,978.94           | 108.48             | 2,087.42          | 2,255.43                     | 7.4                          |
| 1984    | 132.25              | 50.41              | 182.66            | 1,840.77           | 111.41             | 1,952.18          | 2,134.84                     | 8.6                          |
| Average | 114.10              | 38.99              | 153.09            | 1,717.59           | 107.55             | 1,822.14          | 1,975.23                     | 7.7                          |

(Source: Adapted from Fisheries Statistics, Department of Fisheries, Bangkok, Thailand)

TABLE 1.2

NUMBER OF FARMS, AREA, PRODUCTION AND  
VALUE OF INLAND AQUACULTURE IN THAILAND, 1975-1984

| Year    | No.<br>of<br>Farms | Area under<br>culture<br>(1,000 rai) <sup>1</sup> | Production | Production           | Value<br>(million<br>baht) <sup>2</sup> |
|---------|--------------------|---|------------|----------------------|---|
|         |                    |   | (tons)     | per Area<br>(kg/rai) |   |
| 1975    | 24,095             | 144.35  | 29,835.5   | 206.7                | 297.00                                  |
| 1976    | 22,086             | 143.44  | 32,358.4   | 225.6                | 337.00                                  |
| 1977    | 23,427             | 147.59  | 33,141.4   | 224.5                | 415.75                                  |
| 1978    | 23,663             | 151.82  | 39,336.7   | 259.1                | 426.50                                  |
| 1979    | 25,280             | 152.89  | 29,461.7   | 192.7                | 236.25                                  |
| 1980    | 29,484             | 157.43  | 34,504.6   | 219.2                | 598.92                                  |
| 1981    | 31,676             | 163.69  | 48,023.1   | 293.4                | 1,006.04                                |
| 1982    | 34,154             | 173.72  | 45,828.4   | 263.8                | 880.03                                  |
| 1983    | 35,751             | 233.73  | 46,966.4   | 200.9                | 1,005.58                                |
| 1984    | 38,235             | 200.77  | 50,410.9   | 251.1                | 1,226.36                                |
| Average | 28,785             | 166.94  | 38,986.7   | 233.7                | 642.94                                  |

(Source : Annual Fisheries Statistics, Department of Fisheries,  
Bangkok, Thailand)

<sup>1</sup> One rai equals 0.16 hectare.

<sup>2</sup> Computed by dividing production with area under culture.

TABLE 1.3

**PRODUCTION, VALUE AND AVERAGE PRICE  
OF MAIN SPECIES IN INLAND FISH CULTURE IN THAILAND, 1984**

| Species                 | Production |        | Value        |        | Average<br>Price<br>(baht/kg) |
|-------------------------|------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------------------------|
|                         | tons       | %      | 1,000 baht   | %      |                               |
| Sepat Siam              | 11,780.67  | 23.37  | 143,797.68   | 11.73  | 12.21                         |
| Pangasius               | 8,173.75   | 16.21  | 88,539.08    | 7.22   | 10.83                         |
| Tilapia                 | 7,953.24   | 15.78  | 115,881.78   | 9.45   | 14.57                         |
| Thai Silver Carp        | 4,914.28   | 9.75   | 94,400.57    | 7.70   | 19.21                         |
| Snake-head              | 4,862.81   | 9.64   | 162,688.25   | 13.27  | 33.46                         |
| Clarias                 | 4,598.75   | 9.13   | 136,056.23   | 11.09  | 29.58                         |
| Giant Fresh-water Prawn | 3,102.22   | 6.15   | 342,535.69   | 27.93  | 110.42                        |
| Common Carp             | 1,211.70   | 2.40   | 33,891.45    | 2.76   | 27.57                         |
| Sand Goby               | 281.65     | 0.56   | 50,306.15    | 4.10   | 178.61                        |
| Others                  | 3,531.83   | 7.01   | 58,261.26    | 4.75   | 16.50                         |
| Total                   | 50,410.90  | 100.00 | 1,226,358.14 | 100.00 | 24.33                         |

( Source : Fisheries Statistics, Department of Fisheries, Bangkok,  
Thailand )

Clarias and Common Carp, as in Table 1.3. Although Sand Goby is the least important in terms of quantity, it is approximately 4.10 per cent in terms of total value produced. Because Sand Goby ranks the highest in terms of average price, it has been identified as an important species for further development in inland aquaculture. There is increasing domestic and foreign demand for this species.

#### SAND GOBY CULTURE IN THAILAND

Sand (Marble) Goby is commercially caught in natural waters of Thailand. Sand Goby (*Oxyeleotris Marmorata*) is the largest in size (see Appendix A). The natural range of Sand Goby includes Thailand and Malaysia as well as Sumatra and Borneo in Southeast Asia. The species occurs in rivers and reservoirs in Thailand. The largest concentration is in the central part of the Chao Phraya River system including the main stream and its associated tributaries such as the Nan, Lopburi, Pasak and Ta Chin (see Appendix B).

Sand Goby farming started about ten years ago in Thailand and grew rapidly. It is now mostly produced from cage culturing. Pond culture of Sand Goby is also being carried out but only on a small scale. Output of Sand Goby increased from 13.80 tons in 1975 to 601.84 tons in 1981 but plummeted to 95.52, 85.08 and 281.65 tons in 1982 through 1984 due to unexplained excessive mortalities. General information indicates a recovery of production in 1983 and 1984 with some recurring mortality problems. The average Sand Goby

TABLE 1.4

SAND GOBY CULTURE PRODUCTION,  
AMOUNT AND (FARM-GATE) VALUE IN THAILAND, 1975-1984

| Year    | Production<br>(tons) | Value<br>(million baht) | Average Price <sup>1</sup><br>(baht/kg) |
|---------|----------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 1975    | 13.80                | 0.87                    | 62.91                                   |
| 1976    | 13.70                | 1.15                    | 84.21                                   |
| 1977    | 96.09                | 9.16                    | 95.36                                   |
| 1978    | 25.02                | 2.74                    | 109.57                                  |
| 1979    | 127.31               | 15.99                   | 125.62                                  |
| 1980    | 162.82               | 26.13                   | 160.48                                  |
| 1981    | 601.84               | 108.14                  | 179.69                                  |
| 1982    | 95.52                | 17.99                   | 188.36                                  |
| 1983    | 85.08                | 14.92                   | 175.63                                  |
| 1984    | 281.65               | 50.31                   | 178.61                                  |
| Average | 150.28               | 24.74                   | 136.04                                  |

( Source : Adapted from Fisheries Statistics, Department of Fisheries, Bangkok, Thailand )

<sup>1</sup> computed by dividing value with production.