

International Journal of Chemical Studies

P-ISSN: 2349–8528 E-ISSN: 2321–4902 IJCS 2019; 7(5): 4400-4402 © 2019 IJCS Received: 21-07-2019 Accepted: 25-08-2019

Thorat TD

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

VG Naik

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

RA Tasbi

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

Corresponding Author: Thorat TD

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

Cost return and profitability in brinjal in Ratnagiri district

Thorat TD, VG Naik and RA Tasbi

Abstract

The brinjal or eggplant (*solanum melongena*) is one of the most popular and principal vegetable crop grown in India and other part of world. In recent year in Konkan region area under brinjal cultivation is increasing. However, information regarding cost, returns and profitability of brinjal is scanty. So efforts are made in this paper to study cost, returns and profitability of brinjal. The total cost of cultivation (cost 'C') of brinjal was worked out to be \gtrless 181039. Out of the total cost the share of human labour was maximum (40.68%) which was followed by rental value of land (39.19%). At the overall level out of total cost (cost C) the input cost comprises 31.80 per cent, cost 'A' was 35.26 per cent and cost 'B' was 77.29 per cent. It is found that brinjal cultivation is profitable at all levels cost in all the groups. The net return at Cost-C were \gtrless 213467, $\end{Bmatrix}$ 230746 and $\end{Bmatrix}$ 290671 in case of small, medium and large group respectively, while it was $\end{Bmatrix}$ 244961 at overall level. The benefit cost ratio on small, medium, large size farm and at overall level was estimated to 2.30, 2.32, 2.42 and 2.35 respectively.

Keywords: Cost, return, profitability 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 assess "Economics of production 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 and percentage. For estimation of cost standard cost concept (Cost A, B and C) are used.

Result and Discussion

It is observed that, total cost of cultivation (cost 'C') of brinjal was worked out to \gtrless 164533, \gtrless 174254 and \gtrless 204329 in small, medium and large group respectively, Whereas at the overall level, it was worked out to \gtrless 181039. This indicated that, the cost of cultivation of brinjal showed an increasing trend with increase in size of farm.

At the overall level, the total cost of cultivation (cost 'C') of brinjal was worked out to be \gtrless 181039. Out of the total cost the share of expenditure on human labour was maximum (40.68%) which was followed by rental value of land (39.19%), fertilizer (3.40%), manure (1.91%), bullock labour (1.79%), seed (1.24%), irrigation (0.69%) and plant protection

(0.62%). At the overall level out of total cost (cost C) the input cost comprises 31.80 per cent, cost 'A' was 35.26 per cent and cost 'B' was 77.29 per cent.

It is observed that per hectare gross returns in small group, medium group and large group were ₹ 378000, ₹ 405000 and ₹ 495000 respectively while at overall level gross returns were ₹ 426000. The net return at Cost-C were ₹ 213467, ₹

230746 and ₹ 290671 in case of small group, medium group and large group respectively, while it was ₹ 244961 at overall level. It is found that the brinjal was profitable at all levels cost in all the groups. The benefit –cost ratio on small, medium, large size farm and at overall level were estimated to 2.30, 2.32, 2.42 and 2.35 respectively.

Sr. No	Particulars	Group						
	Particulars	Small (N=24)	Medium (N=17)	Large (N=19)	Overall (N=60)			
	Hired labour (days)							
1	Male	49	62	80	64			
	Female	82	96	110	96			
	Total	135	158	190	161			
	Family labour (days)							
2	Male	70	59	49	59			
2	Female	96	87	82	88			
	Total	161	146	131	146			
	Total labour (days)							
3	Male	119	121	129	123			
3	Female	178	183	192	184			
	Total	296	304	321	307			
	Machinery and bullock labour							
4	power tiller	0	0	2	1			
	Bullock labour	2	3	2	2			
5	Seed (kg.)	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.75			
6	Manures (tonnes)	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.33			
7	Fertilizer (kg.)							
	Ν	124	136	155	138			
	P ₂ O ₅	60	68	72	67			
	K ₂ O	60	68	72	67			
8	Insecticide (lit)	1.3	1.95	2.15	1.8			
9	fungicide (Kg)	1.12	1.5	1.9	1.51			

Table 1: Per hectare physical input use in brinjal cultivation.

Table 2: Per hectare cost of cultivation for brinjal (Figures in ₹)

Sn No	Particulars			Amount			
Sr. No.				Medium	Large	Overall	
1	Hired human labour	a Mala dave	14700	18600		19100	
		a. Male days	(8.93)	(10.67)	(11.75)	(10.55)	
		h Famala dave	16400	19160	22000	19187	
		0. Pennale days	(9.97)	(11.00)	(10.77)	(10.60)	
	Total			37760	46000	38287	
	Total			(21.67)	(22.51)	(21.15)	
2	power tille	ar.	0	0		1800	
2	power the	Small Medium Large a. Male days 14700 18600 24000 (8.93) (10.67) (11.75) b. Female days 16400 19160 22000 (9.97) (11.00) (10.77) al 31100 37760 46000 (18.90) (21.67) (22.51) tiller 0 0 5400 labour (1.890) (21.67) (22.51) (0) (0) (2.64) (1.72) (1.08) labour 2100 2250 2400 (1.28) (1.29) (1.17) ares 2100 2250 2400 (1.28) (1.29) (1.17) ares 2100 2250 2400 (1.70) (2.07) (1.96) pers(kg) 5545 6252 6686 (3.37) (3.59) (3.27) charges 1060 1280 1400 (0.64) (0.73) (0.69) otection 824 11	(0.99)				
3	bullock labo	nur.				3233	
5		a. Male days 1 b. Female days 1 (1) 1 b. Female days 1 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (1) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (3) 3 (4) 3 (2) 3 (2) 3 (3) 3 (4) 3 (5) 3 (2) 3 (3) 3 (4) (· /	. ,	. ,	(1.79)	
4	4 Seeds					2250	
-	50045		· /	· · · ·	· · · ·	(1.24)	
5	Manures					3467	
			· /			(1.91)	
6	Fertilizers(kg)					6161	
-			· /		· · · ·	(3.40)	
7	Fertilizers(kg) Irrigation charges				1247		
-	6	Small Small a. Male days 1470 b. Female days 1640 (9.97) 3110 (18.90) 0 b. Female days 1640 (9.97) 3110 (18.90) 0 (18.90) 0 b. Female days 0 (18.90) 0 (1.90) 0 (00) 0 (1.02) 0 (kg) 2800 (kg) (3.37) arges 1066 (0.64) 0.64 (ction) 824 (0.50) 0.64 (29.11) 0.64 per cent for 6 month 1438 (0.87) 0.87 n implements 3208 nd taxes 411 (0.02) 5261 (31.99) (31.99)	· /	· · · ·	· · · ·	(0.69)	
8	Plant protect	b. Female days b. Female days ler cour ss (kg) aarges ction st per cent for 6 month n implements and taxes				1124	
	*		$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		< /	(0.62)	
	Input cost					57569	
			< /			(31.80)	
9	Int. on working capital @ 6 p	per cent for 6 month				1727	
			· /		· · · ·	(0.95) 4471	
10	Depreciation on farm					(2.47)	
			· · · ·	(5865 (2.87) (60	
11	Land revenue and taxes			-		(0.03)	
			· /		()	63827	
Cost "A"						(35.26)	
~ 4401 ~							

12 Rental value of land(1/6 th of gross		oss value land revenue)	62960	67440	82420	70940
12	Kental value of land(1/0 th of gr	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(40.34)	40.34) (39.18)		
13	Int. on fixed capital		4126	4822	6517	5155
15	Int. on fixed ca	apitai	(2.51)	(2.77)	(3.19)	(2.85)
Cost "B"			119700	133633	166432	139922
	Cost "B"			(76.69)	(81.45)	(77.29)
	Family labour	a Mala	20940	17610	17610 14550	17700
		a. Maie	(12.73)	(10.11) (7.12)	(7.12)	(9.78)
14		h Famala 19100	19100	17480	16400	17660
14		0. remaie	(11.61)	(10.03) (8.03)	(8.03)	(9.75)
	Total		40040	35090	30950	35360
			(24.34)	(20.14)	(15.15)	(19.53)
15	supervision charges (100	(of input cost)	4793	4793 5531 6947		5757
15	supervision charges (10% of input cost)		(2.91)	(3.17)	(3.40)	(3.18)
Cost "C"			164533	174254	204329	181039
	Cost- "C"			(100)	(100)	(100)

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

Table 3: Per hectare	profitability of brinjal	cultivation (Figure in ₹)
----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

Sr. No	Particulars	Small(N=24)	Medium(N=17)	Large(N=19)	Overall(N=60)	
1	Yield (tonnes)	12.6	13.5	16.5	14.2	
2	Gross returns (Rs)	378000	405000	495000	426000	
	Cost of cultivation (Rs)					
2	Cost-A	52615	61371	77495	63827	
3	Cost-B	119700	133633	166432	139922	
	Cost-C	164533	174254	204329	181039	
	Net returns at					
4	Cost –A	325385	343629	417505	362173	
4	Cost-B	258300	271367	328568	286078	
	Cost-C	213467	230746	290671	244961	
5	Per quintal cost (Rs)	1694	1709	1762	1725	
6	Benefit -cost ratio	2.30	2.32	2.42	2.35	

Conclusion

The per hectare cost of brinjal cultivation indicate that, the maximum cost was incurred on human labour (40.68%) out of which cost incurred on hired labour was more than than family labour. The analysis of per hectare profitability of brinjal indicated that the brinjal cultivation was profitable enterprise at all the levels of cost, resulting benefit-cost ratio of 2.35.

Reference

- 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.
- 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, Conf. Spl. 1995, 62.

7. Nandeshwar NS, Jagannath, Pritesh T, Shashikumar M. Economics of production and marketing of vegetables in Akola district. Globle journal of biology and health sciences. 2013; 2(2):78-82.