



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2017; 6(5): 501-503
Received: 01-07-2017
Accepted: 02-08-2017

Rajashekar

Student MSc (Agricultural Economics) Department of Agricultural Economics Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad Uttar Pradesh, India

Dr. Dinesh Kumar

Associate Professor Department of Agricultural Economics, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad Uttar Pradesh, India

Correspondence

Rajashekar

Student MSc (Agricultural Economics) Department of Agricultural Economics Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad Uttar Pradesh, India

Price spread of ginger in Bidar district of Karnataka

Rajashekar and Dr. Dinesh Kumar

Abstract

The study was conducted in the year 2016 – 2017 to study the “Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and price spread of Ginger in Bidar district of Karnataka” It revealed that, Price spread in channel I, and channel II were (Rs.890/quintal and Rs.1130/ quintal) respectively. Producer’s share in consumer’s rupee for the channel I was 85.21 per cent, and for channel II was 80.82 per cent. Marketing efficiency for channel I was 4.10 per cent, and for the channel II was 3.23 per cent.

Key words: price spread and ginger.

Introduction

India is rightly called as “spice bowl of the world” for its production of variety and superior quality spices. Growing of spices for various purposes has been famous since the ancient times. There are records about its various properties in Vedas as early as 6000 BC. India is known for trade since the exploration of sea routes. All these attracted the foreigners to India and this was the key reason why India invaded by European countries and was imperialized. To such an extent India was famous for the spices. According to the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS), 63 spices are grown in India. The spices are grown throughout the country from tropical to temperate climate. India has highest number of spice varieties in the world. Ginger can and has been used in many different products. Ginger tea has been used as a carminative and for the treatment of colds at their onset for centuries. It has been used in China as a tonic. The Greeks, after a large meal, used to wrap bread around a piece of ginger and eat it to ease indigestion. In England, ginger was added to beer, forerunner to ginger ale, as a remedy for diarrhea, nausea and vomiting. The Chinese also considered ginger root to be an antidote to shellfish poisoning, explaining why it is found in so many sea food dishes. Ginger is popular because of its pungent flavour. It is a complement to many meals, drinks and desserts. Due to its popularity and diverse scope for product development it would be advantageous for the local communities of Nepal to value add their products. This would assist in gaining a higher profit margin for the local producers and product variety for consumers in local markets and in Kathmandu. It would lessen the gap between products produced in Nepal and those imported from overseas and be an import replacing Nepal made product. With an appeal for ginger-based preparations, ginger oil etc, have been encouraged. It is very useful for cold induced diseases, like nausea, asthma, cough, heart palpitation, syperia and home remedy in the country as it was 2000 years ago. These added medicinal values besides taste-maker need to be popularized, supported with clinical tests having scientific evidences. Ginger contains 2-3 per cent protein, 0.9 per cent fat, 1.2 per cent minerals, 2.4 percent fiber, 12.3 per cent carbohydrate and a good source of calcium, phosphorous, iron and vitamins. The pungency of ginger has all the constituents, which are needed for good health and improving the quality of food.

Objective

To workout the disposal pattern, marketing cost, marketing margin and price spread of ginger.

Materials and Methods

Ginger cultivation is practiced throughout the district. However, the large scale cultivation of Ginger is concentrated mainly in humnabad taluk extending on an area of 1020 hectares. Hence, humnabad taluk was specifically selected for the study. The information on area under Ginger crop and number of Ginger growers from the selected villages was obtained from the respective village accountants (Talati). A proportionate sample of ten per cent of the population from each village was selected randomly. Thus, the total size of the sample selected for the study was 120. For analyzing the data collected during the study, tabular analysis and financial analysis were employed.

The technique of tabular analysis was employed for estimating the cost of cultivation, yield and return structure of Ginger.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and Price Spread in different Size of Farms Group
(Value in Rupees/qtl)

Channel-I = Producer → Commission Agents/ Wholesaler
→Retailer → Consumer

Sl. No	Particulars	Rs/Quintal
1	Producer sale price to Commission agent	3200.00
2	Cost incurred by the producer	
I	Packing cost	10.00 (0.27)
Ii	Packing material cost	5.00 (0.14)
Iii	Transportation cost	20.00 (0.55)
Iv	Market cost	10.00 (0.27)
V	Labour cost	20.00 (0.55)
Vi	Loading and unloading charges	15.00 (0.41)
Vii	Weighing charges	5.00 (0.14)
Viii	Miscellaneous charges	10.00 (0.27)
3	Total cost (i-viii)	90.00 (2.47)
4	Net price received by producer	3110.00 (85.21)
5	Sale price of producer to Commission agent/ Wholesaler	3200.00 (87.67)
6	Cost incurred by the Commission agent/ Wholesaler	
I	Loading and unloading charges	10.00 (0.27)
Ii	Packing cost	5.00 (0.14)
Iii	Market fee	10.00 (0.27)
iV	Losses & Miscellaneous charges	10.00 (0.27)
V	Commission agent/ Wholesaler Margin	100.00 (2.74)
7	Total cost (i-vi)	135.00 (3.70)
8	Sale price of Commission agent/ wholesalers to Retailers	3335.00 (91.37)
9	Cost incurred by the Retailers	
I	Weighing charges	10.00 (0.27)
II	Loading and unloading charges	20.00 (0.55)
III	Town charges	15.00 (0.41)
IV	Carriage up to shop	10.00 (0.27)
V	Miscellaneous charges	10.00 (0.27)
VI	Retailers Margin	250.00 (6.85)
10	Total cost (i-vi)	315.00 (8.63)
11	Sale price of Retailers to consumers	3650.00
12	Price spread	890.00
13	Consumers paid price	3650.00
14	Producer share in consumers rupee	85.21
15	Marketing Efficiency (in %)	4.10

Note: Figure in parenthesis indicate per cent to the total

Table 1 reveals that marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel I. Two intermediaries were identified through which Ginger reaches to the consumer's i.e. commission agents/ wholesalers, Retailers. The producer sells his produce to the commission agent/wholesalers, who in turn sell it to retailers in the market. Finally the produce reaches to consumers after collecting margin. Average marketing cost when producers sold their produce to commission agents/wholesalers in the market was Rs. 90/qtl. Among these cost miscellaneous charges was most important which accounted for Rs. 10/qtl, followed by labour cost Rs. 20/qtl, transportation Rs.20/qtl, loading and unloading cost Rs. 15/qtl, market fee Rs. 10/qtl, packing material cost Rs. 5/qtl, weighing charges Rs. 5/qtl, and packing cost was Rs. 10/qtl, respectively. Sale price of the producer to commission agents/

retailers was Rs. 3200/qtl in different farms size group.

In these channel marketing cost of the producer, commission agents/wholesalers and retailers was 2.47 per cent, 3.70 per cent and 8.63 per cent of consumers paid price respectively. The commission agent/ wholesalers margin was estimated to be 2.74 per cent and the retailer's margin was 6.85 per cent of the consumer paid price. Producer share in consumer price was 85.21 per cent. Price spread was Rs.890/quintal. Market efficiency was 4.10 in different size of farms group.

Table 2: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin and Price Spread in different Size of Farms Group
Channel-II = Producer → Contractor → Commission Agents/Wholesaler →Retailer →Consumer (Value in Rupees/qtl)

Sl. No	Particulars	Rs/Quintal
1	Producer sale price to Contractor	3050
2	Cost incurred by the producer	
I	Packing cost	10 (0.27)
Ii	Packing material cost	5 (0.14)
Iii	Transportation cost	20 (0.55)
Iv	Market cost	10 (0.27)
V	Labour cost	20 (0.55)
Vi	Loading and unloading charges	20 (0.55)
Vii	Weighing charges	5 (0.14)
Viii	Miscellaneous charges	10 (0.27)
3	Total cost (i-viii)	100 (2.74)
4	Net price received by producer	2950 (80.82)
5	Sale price of producer to Contractor	3050 (83.56)
6	Cost incurred by the Contractor	
I	Loading and unloading charges	20 (0.55)
Ii	Packing cost	10 (0.27)
Iii	Transportation cost	20 (0.55)
Iv	Losses & Miscellaneous charges	10 (0.27)
V	Contractor Margin	80 (2.19)
7	Total cost (i-v)	140 (3.84)
8	Sale price of contractor to Commission agent/ Wholesaler	3190 (87.40)
9	Cost incurred by the Commission agent/ Wholesaler	
I	Loading and unloading charges	20 (0.55)
Ii	Packing cost	10 (0.27)
Iii	Market fee	10 (0.27)
Iv	Losses & Miscellaneous charges	10 (0.27)
V	Commission agent/ Wholesaler Margin	100 (2.74)
10	Total cost (i-vi)	150 (4.11)
11	Sale price of Commission agent/ wholesalers to Retailers	3340 (91.84)
12	Cost incurred by the Retailers	
I	Weighing charges	10 (0.27)
II	Loading and unloading charges	20 (0.55)
III	Town charges	10 (0.27)
IV	Carriage up to shop	10 (0.27)
V	Miscellaneous charges	10 (0.27)
VI	Retailers Margin	250 (6.85)
13	Total cost (i-vi)	310.00 (8.49)
14	Sale price of Retailers to consumers	3650
15	Price spread	1130
16	Consumers paid price	3650
17	Producer share in consumers rupee	80.82
18	Marketing Efficiency (in %)	3.23

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicates percentage to the total consumer price.

Table 2: reveals that marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel II. Three intermediaries were identified through which Ginger reaches to the consumer's i.e.

contractor, commission agents/ wholesalers, Retailers. This is the longest channel among two identified channels. The producer sells his produce to the contractor, and contractor to commission agent/wholesalers. Who in turn sell it to it to retailers in the market. Finally the produce reaches to consumers after collecting margin. Average marketing cost when producers sold their produce to contractor was Rs. 100/qtl. Among these cost miscellaneous charges was most important which accounted for Rs. 10/qtl, followed by labour cost Rs. 20/qtl, transportation Rs.20/qtl, loading and unloadingcostRs. 20/qtl, market fee Rs. 10/qtl, packing material cost Rs. 5/qtl, weighing charges Rs.5/qtl, and packing cost was Rs.10/qtl, respectively. Sale price of the producer to commission agents/ retailers was Rs. 3050/qtl in different farms size group.

In these channel marketing cost of the producer, contractor, commission agents/wholesalers and retailers was 2.74 per cent, 3.84 per cent, 4.11 per cent and 8.49 per cent of consumers paid price respectively. The contractor margin was estimated to be 2.19 per cent and the retailer's margin was 6.85 per cent of the consumer paid price. Producer share in consumer price was 80.82 per cent. Price spread was Rs.1130/quintal. Market efficiency was 3.23.

Conclusion

The list of results obtained in this research study concludes that there is scope to increase the producer's share in consumer's rupee by making the market more effective so that the number of intermediaries is to be restricted and marketing costs (Channel I, II was Rs.190 and 270 per qtl) and marketing margins(Channel I and II was Rs. 350 and 430 per qtl) to be reduced. This will be the way for making Ginger cultivation more lucrative.

Reference

1. Hatai. Economics of production and marketing of strategies of potato in Orissa. *Indian J. Mktg.* 2007; 30(2):17-21.
2. Navadkar DS, Sale DL, Patil VD. Marketing of vegetables grown around Pune city, *Agricultural Situation in India*, 2005; 62(4): 259-265.
3. Papang JanailinS, Tripathi AK, Anoop M, Choudhary Bis hwa Bhaskar. Economics of turmeric marketing in Jaintia Hills district of Meghalaya. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development year.* 2016; 12(1):155-160.
4. Pawar ND, Pawar BR. Price spread and marketing efficiency of green chillies in watershed area of Marathwada. *Agric. Mktg.*, 2005; 7(6):48-51.
5. Patil SA, JM Talathi, SS Wadkar, VK Khobarkar. Price Spread in Marketing of capsicum in Thane district of Maharastra state. *Agric. Mktg.* 2007; 12(3):42-47.
6. Raman Rao. Price spread and efficiency of sorghum grain marketing in Mahabubnagar District of Andhra Pradesh. *The Bihar J. of Agric. Mktg.* 2008; 15(4):156-167.
7. Districts at Glance, BIDAR, 2016-2017.