



P-ISSN: 2349-8528

E-ISSN: 2321-4902

IJCS 2019; 7(5): 2038-2040

© 2019 IJCS

Received: 10-07-2019

Accepted: 12-08-2019

TD Thorat

M.Sc. Student, Department of
Agricultural Economics,
Dr. B.S. Konkan Krishi
Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, District
Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, India

VG Naik

Associate Professor, Department
of Agricultural Economics,
Dr. B.S. Konkan Krishi
Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, District
Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, India

VA Thorat

Associate Professor, Department
of Agricultural Economics,
Dr. B.S. Konkan Krishi
Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, District
Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, India

Marketing of brinjal in Ratnagiri districts

Thorat TD, VG Naik and VA Thorat

Abstract

The brinjal or eggplant (*Solanum melongena*) is one of the profitable crop. However, information regarding to marketing of brinjal in konkan region is scanty. So efforts are made in the paper to identify marketing channel involved in brinjal and price spread in various channel. The main channels of marketing of brinjal identified in the study area were 1) Producer- Consumer 2) Producer- Retailer- Consumer 3) Producer- Wholesaler-Retailer- Consumer. The producer's share in consumer's rupee was highest 92.72 per cent in channel-I, followed by 86.10 per cent in channel-II and 65.83 per cent in channel-III. Thus it can be concluded that, involvement of the intermediaries has decreased the producer's share in consumer's rupee.

Keywords: Brinjal, marketing channel, cost incurred, price spread etc.

Introduction

The brinjal or eggplant (*Solanum melongena*) is one of the most popular and principal vegetable crop grown in India and other part of world. The cultivated brinjal is presumed to be of Indian origin with China as secondary centre of origin. It is a member of solanaceae family and is closely related to tomato and potato. The brinjal contain approximately 92 percent moisture, 6 percent carbohydrate, 1 percent protein, 0.3 percent fats and some minerals. They are fairly good source of calcium, phosphorous, iron and vitamin B. Brinjal has been reported to have ayurvedic medicinal properties. In recent year in Konkan region area under brinjal cultivation is increasing. However, information regarding cost, return and profitability from brinjal is scanty. In view of this the effort are made to study "Economics of production and marketing of brinjal in Ratnagiri district".

Methodology

The present investigation was carried out in Ratnagiri district. From the Ratnagiri district, Dapoli and Khed tahsils were selected for study and clusters of villages growing brinjal were identified. From the available clusters three clusters from each tahsil were selected randomly. From each cluster 10 farmers growing brinjal in Rabi season were selected randomly. Thus, the final sample consists of two tehsils, six clusters of villages and 60 brinjal growers. The data were collected by survey method with the help of specially designed schedules separately for brinjal cultivators. The data were analyzed by using simple statistical tools like arithmetic mean, percentage, price spread, producer share in consumer rupee and marketing efficiency.

Result and discussion

The main channels of marketing of brinjal identified in the study area were 1) Producer- Consumer 2) Producer- Retailer- Consumer 3) Producer- Wholesaler-Retailer- Consumer. It was observed that maximum numbers of farmers (38) were used channel I followed by channel II (27) and channel III (6). While, maximum proportion of marketed surplus (49.37%) distributed through the channel II followed by channel III (32.40%) and channel I (18.23%).

It is observed from that, the per quintal marketing expenses incurred by producer were highest in channel-I (₹ 82/q) followed by channel -II (₹ 76.5/q) and channel -III (₹ 76.5/q). It is seen that per quintal cost incurred by wholesalers were ₹ 245 out of which marketing charges were 18.28 per cent, transportation cost was 17.47 per cent, labour cost during handling was 15.92 per cent, repacking cost was 9.41 per cent and miscellaneous expenditure were 4.66 per cent. It is observed that cost incurred by retailers were ₹ 128 out of which transportation cost was 16.85 per cent, labour cost during handling was 14.88 per cent and miscellaneous expenditure were 2.54 per cent.

Correspondence**TD Thorat**

M.Sc. Student, Department of
Agricultural Economics,
Dr. B.S. Konkan Krishi
Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, District
Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, India

The producer's share in consumer's rupee was highest 92.72 per cent in channel-I, followed by 86.10 per cent in channel-II and 65.83 per cent in channel-III. Thus it can be concluded

that, involvement of the intermediaries has decreased the producer's share in consumer's rupee.

Table 1: Disposal pattern of brinjal (Figures in q)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Small (N=24)	Medium (N=17)	large (N=19)	overall (N=60)
1	Production	126	135	165	142
		(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
2	Disposal				
	a. Home consumption	0.21	0.26	0.35	0.27
		(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.19)
	b. Gift to relatives	0.14	0.18	0.21	0.18
		(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.12)
	c. losses	0.42	0.55	0.77	0.58
(0.33)		(0.41)	(0.47)	(0.41)	
Total	0.77	0.99	1.33	1.03	
	(0.61)	(0.73)	(0.81)	(0.73)	
3	Marketable surplus	125.23	134.01	163.67	140.97
		(99.39)	(99.27)	(99.19)	(99.28)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages to the total production)

Table 2: Channel-wise marketing of Brinjal

Sr. No.	Channels of Marketing	Number of cultivators	Average quantity marketed (q)
1	Producer – consumer	38	24.08
			(18.23)
2	Producer - retailer – consumer	27	65.20
			(49.37)
3	Producer - wholesaler -retailer –consumer	6	42.80
			(32.40)
	Total	71	132.07
			(100)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages to the total)

Table 3: Market expenses incurred by producer in different channel of marketing of brinjal. (Figures in ₹/ q)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Group		
		Channel I	Channel II	Channel III
1	Grading charges	2.5	4	4
2	Packaging charges	5.25	5	5
3	Transport cost	30	28	28
4	Estimated losses in transit	43	40	40
6	Market charges	1.25	0	0
	Total	82	77	77

Table 4: Market expenses incurred by retailer and wholesaler

Sr. No	Particulars	₹./q	Per cent
1	Cost incurred by Wholesaler		
	Repacking	35	9.43
	Labour cost during handling	59	15.91
	Transportation	68	18.33
	Market charges	68	18.33
	Miscellaneous (Rent of stall, Furniture, Electricity, License fee, maintenance)	17	4.58
	Sub-total charges	244	65.77
2	Cost incurred by Retailer		
	Transportation	63	16.98
	Labour cost during handling	55	14.82
	Miscellaneous	9	2.43
	Sub-total charges	127	34.23
	Total	371	100

Table 5: Channel-wise price spread and marketing efficiency in marketing of brinjal (Figures in ₹)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III
1	Net price received by producer	3518	3122	2422
2	Cost incurred by producer	82	77	77
		(2.28)	(2.11)	(2.08)
3	Purchase Price by wholesaler/commission agent	-	-	2500
4	Cost incurred by wholesaler/commission agent	-	-	245
				(7)
5	Marketing margin by wholesaler/commission agent	-	-	480
				(13)
6	Purchase Price by retailer	-	3200	3251
7	Cost incurred by retailer	-	128	128
			(3.52)	(3.47)
8	Marketing margin by retailer	-	300	300
			(8.27)	(8.16)
9	Total marketing cost	82	204	449
		(2.28)	(5.63)	(12.20)
10	Total marketing margin	0	300	780
		(0)	(8.27)	(21.21)
11	Consumers price	3600	3626	3678
		(100)	(100)	(100)
12	Producer share in consumer rupee (%)	97.72	86.10	65.83
13	Marketing efficiency (ME) (%)	42.9	6.19	1.97

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages to consumer price)

Conclusion

It can be concluded that, involvement of the intermediaries has decreased the producers share in consumer's rupee and marketing efficiency.

Reference

1. Barker N, Kumar D, Singh N. An economic analysis of brinjal in Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh state. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*. 2017; 8(3):15925-15929.
2. Godambe RB, Torane SR, Talathi JM, Kshirsagar PJ. Cost return and profitability of okra in Thane district of Maharashtra. *The Asian Journal of Horticulture*. 2018; 11(1):14-18.
3. Jorwar RM, Ulemale DH, Sarap SM. Economics of production and marketing of tomato in Amravati district. *International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics*. 2017; 8(1):2231-6434.
4. Kerutagi MG, Kotikal YK, Sudhindra M. Cost and return of brinjal production in Gokak taluk of Belgaum district. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2000; 13(2):500-502.
5. Madalia VK, Kukadia MU. Cost and returns in vegetable cultivation. *Financing Agricultural Economics Research Review*. 1978; 10(1):15-18.
6. Maurya OP, Kushwaha RS, Singh GN, Trivedi DS. Economics of production and marketing of Okra (Lady's finger) in Varanasi district (Uttar Pradesh). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, 1995, 62.
7. Nandeshwar NS, Jagannath, Pritesh T, Shashikumar M. Economics of production and marketing of vegetables in Akola district. *Globe journal of biology and health sciences*. 2013; 2(2):78-82.