



E-ISSN: 2278-4136

P-ISSN: 2349-8234

www.phytojournal.com

JPP 2021; Sp 10(1): 477-481

Received: 25-10-2020

Accepted: 09-12-2020

Chandrasen Chaurasia

Research Scholar, Department of
Agricultural Economics,
SHAUTS, Naini, Prayagraj,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Dr. Sanjay Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department
of Agricultural Economics,
SHAUTS, Naini, Prayagraj,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Vikas Singh

Research Scholar, Department of
Agricultural Economics,
SHAUTS, Naini, Prayagraj,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Aonla: A study on marketing aspects in Pratapgarh district of Uttar Pradesh

Chandrasen Chaurasia, Dr. Sanjay Kumar and Vikas Singh

Abstract

The study was conducted in Pratapgarh district of Uttar Pradesh. Random sampling technique was used for the selection of blocks, villages and proportionate random sampling for selection of growers. From the list, 200 growers were selected using proportionate sampling method i.e. 90 small, 70 medium and 40 large farmers respectively. The primary data were collected from the respondents by using interview schedule, while secondary data were collected from the official records, published data, magazines etc. The marketable surplus for Aonla in the area was found to be 140, 160 and 180 quintals per farm which constituting (99.10%), (99.48%) and (99.48%) to their total Aonla production. Channel-I, Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to consumer in the market was Rs.90/quintal. Net price received by the producer is 410/quintal. Producer share in consumer price was 82 per cent. Price spread is Rs 90. Marketing efficiency was 5.55 per cent. Channel-II, Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to retailers was Rs.105/quintal. Among these cost transportation charges was most important which accounted for Rs.15/quintal, followed by loading and unloading cost Rs.10/quintal, market cost Rs.10/quintal, labour cost was Rs.10/quintal and miscellaneous cost Rs.50/quintal respectively. Sale price of the producer to retailer was Rs.500/quintals in different farms size group. Channel-III, This is identified as the longest channel. The producer sells his produce to the commission agents, who in turn sell it to retailer in the market. Finally, the produce reaches to the consumer after collecting margin. Average marketing cost when producer sold their produce to commission agents, in the market was Rs.165. Among these grading, cleaning etc. was Rs. 10 and 10 per Qts. loading and unloading cost Rs. 10 per Qtl. Transportation cost Rs. 20per Qts, Miscellaneous charges Rs. 25/qts, respectively.

Keywords: Aonla, marketable surplus, marketed surplus, price spread and marketing channels

Introduction

Aonla (*Emblica Officinalis* Gaertn. Syn. *Phyllanthus emblica* L.), a native of tropical South-East Asia, has been below cultivation in India on the grounds that time immemorial. Aonla or Indian gooseberry (*Emblica Officinalis* Gaertn) is an outstanding fruit and one of the treasured presents of nature to man. It is generally referred to as Amla (Hindi), Adiphala (Sanskrit), Amalaki (Bengali) and Nelli (Malayalam). The Aonla fruit is globular, small, round, six lobed fruit thick and rough inconsistency. It is light yellow in coloration and is sort of 1.5 cm to two.5 cm in diameter. Aonla is indigenous of India. It is full of Vitamin 'C' and used for preparation of several Ayurvedic medicine. Commercial Aonla orchards of indigenous cultivars are established particularly on calcareous and slightly saline soils where other fruit crops generally do not survive. Aonla because of its specific nature has much scope for commercial cultivation. Horticultural crops cover 6.1 per cent of the country's area. The area, production and productivity of fruits have increased, 3.0, 6.2 and 2 times respectively from 1961 to 1999. Creditability of horticultural crops established because of improving the productivity of land, generating employment and improving the economic condition of the farmers. Like green, blue and yellow revaluation, we have another revaluation called the "Golden revolution" with the advancement made in the horticultural sectors.

Aonla (*Emblica officinalis* Gaertn) is the king of arid fruits, popularly known as "Indian gooseberry", is a small-sized minor subtropical fruit grown widely in North India. India ranks first in the world in Aonla area and production volume. It is considered to be a "wonder fruit for health" because of its unique properties. Uses Aonla fruit is very useful in treating many diseases such as diabetes, cough, asthma, bronchitis, headache, dyspepsia, colic, flatulence, skin diseases, leprosy, jaundice, scurvy, diarrhea and cancer. In order to obtain a good income from Aonla, it must be sold immediately in the market; if not, to make profit, proper storage facilities should be available (Kore, *et al.* 2013) [2].

India's ranks IInd in fruits production in the world with the production of 97358.00 thousand MT from 6506.00-thousand-hectare area. Contribution of Aonla in fruit production is 1075.00 thousand MT from 93.00-thousand-hectare area (National Horticulture Board 2017-18).

Corresponding Author:**Chandrasen Chaurasia**

Research Scholar, Department of
Agricultural Economics,
SHAUTS, Naini, Prayagraj,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Uttar Pradesh accounts for nearly 60 per cent of this production. Pratapgarh district of U.P. is a major Aonla producing district covering 7000.90 hectares with the production 31064.30 MT. (Aonla Development Office, Pratapgarh U.P. 2017-18). It is ascertaining from above discussion that Aonla cultivation can certainly help to raise the income and employment of the farming community taking marginal land under utilization.

Methodology

Methodology was used for the study under following heads:

1. Sampling technique
2. Methods of enquiry and collection of data
3. Period of enquiry
4. Analytical tools used

Sampling technique

Various sampling techniques were used as per need.

Selection of district

Pratapgarh district has higher concentration of area under aonla, thus district was selected purposively for the study.

Selection of block

Out of 16 blocks of Pratapgarh district, two blocks namely Sadar and Sandawa Chandrika having highest area under Aonla crop was selected purposively.

Selection of villages

A list of all villages of the selected blocks was prepared along with area under Aonla Cultivation. Then, list of the villages was arranged in descending order according to area under Cultivation. Thereafter, 5-10% villages were selected purposively.

Selection of aonla growers/orchardist

A complete list of all the growers/orchardists was prepared. Therefore, the grower were arranged in ascending order of area under Aonla cultivation and then growers were classified into three groups on the basis of area under Aonla cultivation in all the selected villages viz., First farms group (Small Farmer, 0-1 hectare), Second farms group (Medium Farmer 1-2 hectare), and Third farms group (Large Farmer 2ha or more than 2ha). Out of this list 200 growers were selected randomly.

Table 1: Number of sample households under different categories in the study area

Sl. No.	Villages	Total no. of households				Total no. of selected samples			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total	Small	Medium	Large	Total
1	Gore	130	100	60	290	13	10	6	29
2	Sonawa	140	110	50	300	14	11	5	30
3	Saraydali	120	90	50	260	12	9	5	26
4	Jaitipur	110	80	60	250	11	8	6	25
5	Adharpur	120	90	50	260	12	9	5	26
6	Arjunpur	140	120	60	320	14	12	6	32
7	Kolbajardeeh	140	110	70	320	14	11	7	32
	Total	900	700	400	2000	90	70	40	200

Selection of the market

The data related to prices and arrivals of Aonla was collected from Mahuli market in Sadar block of Pratapgarh district.

Selection of the market functionaries

A list of all market functionaries of both primary and secondary market will be prepared with the help of market head out of total market functionaries 10% market functionaries selected randomly from both market for present study this market functionaries will be considered for data collection regarding different marketing cost and other charges in different marketing channels. Were selected respondent for the present study all together total number 20 Traders, 25 wholesaler, 32 retailers were selected randomly for the study.

Table 2: Details of market functionaries

S. No.	Market (Primary & secondary)	Market functionaries no.	Total
1.	Mahuli market	Traders	20
		Wholesalers	25
		Retailers	32
	Total		77

Methods of enquiry and collection of data

The enquiry was conducted by survey method. The primary data were collected for a period of one year by personal interview with the selected Aonla growers on well prepared schedule and secondary data was collected from the records

available at district head quarter, Block level, Village level officers and Lekhpal.

Period of enquiry

The data was pertained for the agriculture year 2019-20.

Analytical tools

Suitable tabular as well as functional analysis as per need was applied to analyses the data and presentation of the results.

Marketing tools SED in marketing channels

1. Marketing cost

The total cost incurred on marketing by various intermediaries involved in the sale and purchase of the commodity till it reaches the ultimate consumer was computed as follow:

$$M = C_f + C_{m1} + C_{m2} + C_{m3} + \dots + C_{mn}$$

Where,

M = Total cost of marketing

C_f = Cost borne by the producer farmer from the produce leaves the farm till the sale of the produce, and

C_{mn} = Cost incurred by the i^{th} middlemen in the process of buying and selling.

2. Marketable surplus

$$MS = P - C$$

Where,

MS = Marketable surplus

P = Total production

C = Total requirements (Family and farm)

3. Marketing margin of middlemen

(a) Absolute margin = $P_{Ri} - (P_{pi} + C_{mi})$

$$\frac{P_{Ri} - (P_{pi} + C_{mi}) * 100}{P_{Ri}}$$

(b) Percent margin =

4. Producer's share in consumer's rupee

$$\frac{P - (C - M) * 100}{M}$$

Where,

P = Producer's share in Consumer's Rupee

C = Consumers' rupee

M = Marketing cost

5. Price Spread

= Total Marketing Cost + Total Marketing Margin

6. Marketing efficiency

$$\text{Marketing efficiency} = \frac{\text{Consumer price}}{\text{Total marketing cost} + \text{Marketing margin}}$$

Result and Discussion

Marketable surplus

The high marketable surplus was due to the perishable nature of the Aonla that it cannot be stored for a long period of time. Hence, the farmers cultivated tomato mainly for sale in the market to generate profit, which resulted in a high marketable surplus for Aonla in the study area. The marketable surplus for Aonla in the area was found to be 140, 160 and 180 quintals per farm which constituting (99.10%), (99.48%) and (99.48%) to their total Aonla production. And rest quantity used for home consumption, relatives and religious. The marketable surplus was also higher in large size group as compared to medium and small farm size groups. This increase shows that more production at large farms comparatively too small and medium farms respectively, with the sample average, was 158.99 quintal which constituting (99.37%) to total production.

Table 3: Marketable surplus for aonla (Qts) for the study area

Particulars	Small	Medium	Large	Sample average
Total yield produced	140 (100)	160 (100)	180 (100)	160 (100)
Quantity used at home	0.80 (0.57)	0.60 (0.37)	0.65 (0.37)	0.68 (0.42)
Relatives and religious person	0.45 (0.32)	0.23 (0.14)	0.28 (0.15)	0.32 (0.20)
Marketable surplus	138.75 (99.10)	159.17 (99.48)	179.07 (99.48)	158.99 (99.37)

Existing aonla marketing channels in the study areas

In the study area, three different types of marketing channels prevailed through which Aonla production was distributed from the producer to the ultimate consumer, are given below:

Marketing channels

There are three marketing channels for the Aonla marketing in Paragraph district given below

- Channel-I: Producer-Consumer
- Channel-II: Producer- Village merchant/Retailer-Consumer

- Channel-III: Producer-Wholesaler/Commission Agent-Retailer/Village merchant-Consumer

i) Channel- I: Producer-Consumer:

Number of respondents = 200

$$SML = 90 + 70 + 40 = 200$$

(Value in Rupees/Quintal)

Table 4(a): Producer – Consumer

S. No.	Particulars	Sample average
1	Producer sale price to consumer	500
2	Cost incurred by the producer	
I	Cost of packing	15(3.0)
II	Transportation cost	15(3.0)
III	Grading, cleaning, etc	10(2.0)
IV	Loading and unloading charges	10(2.0)
V	Packing material cost (wooden bucket, paper and straw)	15(3.0)
VI	Miscellaneous expenses and losses	25(5.0)
3	Net price received by the producer	410(82.0)
4	Consumers paid price	500(100)
5	Price spread	90
6	Producer share in consumer rupee (%)	82%
	Marketing Efficiency	5.55

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicate percentage to the total consumer price

Above table shows that marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel I. No intermediaries were identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumers. The

producer sells his produce to the consumer. Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to consumer in the market was Rs.90/quintal. Net price received by the producer is

410/quintal. Producer share in consumer price was 82 per cent. Price spread is Rs 90. Marketing efficiency was 5.55 per cent.

(ii) Channel-II: Producer-Village merchant/Retailer-Consumer:

Table 5(b): Producer-village merchant/retailer-consumer

S. No.	Particulars	Sample average
1	Producer sale price to village merchant/retailer	500
2	Cost incurred by the producer	
I	Cost of packing	15(2.34)
ii	Transportation cost	20(3.12)
iii	Grading, cleaning, etc	10(1.15)
iv	Loading and unloading charges	10(1.12)
-*	Packing material cost (wooden bucket, paper and straw)	15(2.34)
vi	weighing charge	5(0.78)
vii	Miscellaneous expenses	30(4.68)
3	Net price received by producer	395(61.71)
4	Total cost	105
5	Sale price of producer to village merchant/retailer	500
	Cost incurred by the village merchant/retailer	
I	Transportation cost	30(4.68)
ii	Labour	20(3.12)
iv	Miscellaneous charges	50(7.81)
6	Total cost incurred by Retailer/Village merchant	100
7	Margin of village merchant/retailer	40(6.25)
8	Sale price of village merchant/retailer to consumer	640(100)
9	Price spread	245
10	Consumers paid price	640
11	Producer share in consumer rupee%	78.12
12	Marketing efficiency	2.66

Note: Figure in the parenthesis indicate percentage to the total consumer price

Above table 5 shows that marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel II. One intermediary was identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumer's ie. Village merchant/Retailer. This is the channel among an identified channel. The producer sells his produce to retailers in the market. Finally, the produce reaches to consumers after collecting margin. Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to retailers was Rs.105/quintal. Among these cost transportation charges was most important which accounted for Rs.15/quintal, followed by loading and unloading cost Rs.10/quintal, market cost Rs.10/quintal, labour cost was

Rs.10/quintal and miscellaneous cost Rs.50/quintal respectively. Sale price of the producer to retailer was Rs.500/quintals in different farms size group.

The retailer's margin was 6.25 per cent of the consumer paid price. Producer share in consumer price was 78.12, price spread was Rs.245 of consumer paid price. Marketing efficiency was 2.66 per cent.

(iii) Channel III: Producer-wholesaler/commission agent-retailer/village merchant-consumer

Table 6(c): Producer-wholesaler/commission agent-retailer/village merchant-consumer

S. No.	Particulars	Sample average
1	Producer sale price to wholesaler/commission agent	500
2	Cost incurred by the producer	
I	Cost of packing	15(2.12)
II	Transportation cost	20(2.83)
III	Grading, cleaning, etc.	10(1.42)
IV	Loading and unloading charges	10(1.42)
V	Packing material cost (wooden bucket, paper and straw)	15(2.12)
VI	weighing charge	5(0.70)
vi	Miscellaneous expenses & losses	25(3.54)
3	Total cost	100
4	Net price received by producer	400(56.73)
5	Sale price of producer to wholesaler/commission agent	500
	Cost incurred by the wholesaler	
I	Loading and unloading charges	10(1.42)
II	Packing cost	10(1.42)
III	Market fee	10(1.42)
IV	Commission of wholesaler/commission agent	60(8.51)
V	Miscellaneous charges	35(4.96)
	Total cost	165
	Margin of wholesaler/commission agent	40(5.69)
9	Sale price of wholesaler/commission agent to retailer/village merchant	705(100)

Cost incurred by the retailer/village merchant		
I	Weighing charges	5(0.70)
II	Loading and unloading charges	10(1.42)
III	Transportation charges	15(2.12)
IV	Carriage up to shop	10(1.42)
V	Miscellaneous charges	25(3.54)
VI	Total cost	65
10	Margin of retailer/village merchant	35(4.96)
11	Sale price retailer/village merchant to consumers	805(100)
12	Price spread	405
13	Consumers paid price	805(100)
14	Producer share in consumer rupee (%)	62.11
15	Marketing efficiency	1.99

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

Table 6 (c): Reveals that marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel III is important because lots of farm i.e. 62.11% of growers preferring sale their produce this channel. Two intermediaries were identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumer's i.e. commission agent, retailer. This is identified as the longest channel. The producer sells his produce to the commission agents, who in turn sell it to retailer in the market. Finally, the produce reaches to the consumer after collecting margin. Average marketing cost when producer sold their produce to commission agents, in the market was Rs.165. Among these grading, cleaning etc. was Rs. 10 and 10 per Qts. loading and unloading cost Rs. 10 per Qtl. Transportation cost Rs. 20per Qts, Miscellaneous charges Rs. 25/qts, respectively. The net price received by the producer was Rs. 400/qts. Sale price of the producer, to commission agents was Rs.500/qts. Among these loading, packing, market fee, commission, margin of wholesaler (Rs.10, 10, 10, 60, 35 and 40/qts) respectively. The sale price of commission agent to village merchant Rs.705/Qts. Cost incurred by village merchant weighing charges, town charges, margin of village merchant etc. (Rs.5,10,15,10,25 and 35/Qts) Sale price retailer/village merchant to consumers Rs. 805, price spread was Rs. 405/qts in different size of farm groups. Producer share in consumer rupee Rs. 62.11 The marketing efficiency is 1.99%.

Summary and Conclusion

The higher marketable surplus was due to the perishable nature of Aonla that it cannot be stored for a long period of time. Hence, the farmers cultivated tomato mainly for sale in the market to generate profit, which resulted in a high marketable surplus for Aonla in the study area. The marketable surplus for Aonla in the area was found to be 140, 160 and 180 quintals per farm which constituting (99.10%), (99.48%) and (99.48%) to their total Aonla production. marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel I. No intermediaries were identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumers. The producer sells his produce to the consumer. Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to consumer in the market was Rs.90/quintal. Net price received by the producer is 410/quintal. Producer share in consumer price was 82 per cent. Price spread is Rs 90. Marketing efficiency was 5.55 per cent. Marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel II. One intermediary was identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumer's i.e. Village merchant/Retailer. This is the channel among an identified channel. The producer sells his produce to retailers in the market. Finally, the produce reaches to consumers after collecting margin. Marketing cost when producers sold their produce to retailers was Rs.105/quintal. Among these cost transportation charges was

most important which accounted for Rs.15/quintal, followed by loading and unloading cost Rs.10/quintal, market cost Rs.10/quintal, labour cost was Rs.10/quintal and miscellaneous cost Rs.50/quintal respectively. Sale price of the producer to retailer was Rs.500/quintals inn different farms size group. Marketing cost, marketing margin, and price spread for channel III is important because lots of farm i.e. 62.11% of growers preferring sale their produce this channel. Two intermediaries were identified through which Aonla reaches to the consumer's i.e. commission agent, retailer. This is identified as the longest channel. The producer sells his produce to the commission agents, who in turn sell it to retailer in the market. Finally, the produce reaches to the consumer after collecting margin. Average marketing cost when producer sold their produce to commission agents, in the market was Rs.165. Among these grading, cleaning etc. was Rs. 10 and 10 per Qts. loading and unloading cost Rs. 10 per Qtl. Transportation cost Rs. 20per Qts, Miscellaneous charges Rs. 25/qts, respectively.

References

1. Aonla Development Office, Pratapgarh U.P 2017-18.
2. Kore, Vijaykumar, T Devi, Lembisana H, Kabir J. Packaging, storage and value addition of Aonla, an underutilized fruit, in India. EDP Sciences 2013;68(3):255-266.
3. National Horticulture Board 2017-18.
4. Mail BK, Bhosale SS, Shendage PN, Kale PV. Economics of production and marketing of banana in Jalgaon district of Western Maharashtra. Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing 2003;17(1):173-179.