International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Marketing of raw cashew nut in Konkan region: An economic analysis

[1]PJ Kshirsagar, [2]AS Akhare and [3]SR Torane

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, DBSKKV, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

[2]Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, DBSKKV, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

[3]Head, Department of Agricultural Economics, DBSKKV, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2024.v7.i2b.317

Corresponding Author: PJ Kshirsagar

Abstract

Maharashtra state is one of the leading cashew growing states in India. The survey was conducted in South Konkan region purposively during 2019 and 2020. A sample of 170 cashew nut growers, 10 wholesalers, 10 dealers, 34 village traders and 34 itinerant merchants was selected randomly. Cashew nut growers from the South Konkan region were disposing off their produce through five different marketing channels i.e. channel I (Grower → Village merchant → Wholesaler → processor), channel II (Grower → Itinerant Merchant → Factory agent → processor), channel III (Grower → Village merchant → processor), channel IV (Grower → Wholesaler → processor) and channel V (Grower → processor). Majority of the farmers sold the raw cashew nuts through village traders in the nearby markets. In South Konkan region per quintal cost of marketing was incurred highest when grower sold his produce directly to the processor. Among the various marketing intermediaries the village merchant takes maximum risk associated with uncertainty in marketing of raw cashew nuts for loss due to price crash during peak harvesting season. In the various items of costs of raw cashew nut marketing, among various market intermediaries, the transportation cost is the major cost item contributing 30 to 33 percent of total cost in South Konkan region. The price spread in different channels of marketing in South Konkan region revealed that the producer share in consumer rupees was highest in (99.69%) channel V followed by channel IV (98.32%), channel I & III (91.86%), and lowest being in channel (84.60%). This was due to highest market margin in channel II accounted to 14.51 percent.

Keywords: Cashew nut, cost, price spread, producer share in consumer rupees, market margin

Introduction

Cashew is a very important plantation crop of India. Cashew nuts are considered to be one of the most nutritious foods in the world despite being rich in calories and low in fiber as they are packed with healthy fats, vitamins, and antioxidants. They contain many essential fatty acids that are beneficial for the human body. Cashew nuts are used mostly in Indian desserts and traditional preparations to enhance their taste. Cashew fetches substantial foreign exchange, account for 27.76 percent of total area under plantation crop and production of cashew nut accounts to 6.13 percent of total production of selected plantation crops in India. Cashew kernel is known for its delicious, pleasant taste and for balanced nutritive profile. Not only in India, but also cashew nut is very famous in other parts of the world as well. India is the largest producer, processor, consumer and exporter of cashew accounting for 24.09 percent and 41.67 percent of the world output and export, respectively. Maharashtra state is one of the leading cashew growing states in India and contributing more than 32 percent of total cashew production of the country. Maharashtra topped in cashew production and productivity with 1.83 lakh MT and 1300 kg/ha, respectively. However cashew is the monopoly of the Konkan region of Maharashtra. In Konkan region out of 1.65 lakhs area under

cashew, 1.43 lakh hectares in South Konkan region and remaining 0.22 lakh hectares in North Konkan region. The farmers in Konkan region have maintained the quality of cashew nut and goodwill in the mind of consumer. The reputation being carried over the years have awarded and recognized as a geographical indication for "Vengurla cashew". Keeping all this aspects in view, the present study entitled "Marketing of Raw Cashew Nut in Konkan Region: An Economic Analysis" has been undertaken.

Methodology

The survey was conducted during 2019 and 2020 in South Konkan region purposively includes Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district. However all tahasils from both the district had been selected for the study and 10 farmers from each tahasil were selected randomly. Hence in all, sample of 170 cashew nut growers involve in marketing of cashew was selected randomly from the south Konkan region comprising Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg districts with 17 tahasils. In case of Wholesaler and Dealer, 5 wholesalers and dealers from each district comprising 10 wholesalers and dealers from the South Konkan region have been selected randomly. Similarly from each tahasil 2 village traders and 2 itinerant merchants were selected randomly comprising 34 samples from each district of South Konkan

region. To analyze the data standard cost concept was employed. The data was collected for the year 2019 and 2020.

Results and Discussion
Marketing of Raw cashew nuts
Disposal of Cashew nuts

Disposal of cashew nuts included total quantity sold, quantity retained for home consumption, gift to relatives and neighbor, wage payment and losses in drying and storage.

The variety wise disposal of cashew nuts including local and HYVs were presented in Table1.

It is seen from the Table 1. That per hectare production of local variety of cashew nuts was 591 kg of which disposal pattern showed that 10.40 kg (1.76%) were kept for wage payment, 2.35 kg (0.40%) were consumed at home, 3.33 kg. (0.56%) were given as gift to relatives, 5.55 kg (0.94%) were the losses in storage and drying. Out of total production of local variety of cashew nuts 96.34 percent (569.37 kg) was observe to be marketed surplus.

Table 1: Per hectare disposal pattern of cashew nut from sample cashew grower

Sr. No.	Variety	Total production of cashew nut (kg.)	Wage payment (kg)	Consumed at home (kg)	Gift for relatives (kg)	Losses in storage and drying (kg)	Actually marketed (kg)
1	Local variety	591	10.40 (1.76)	2.35 (0.40)	3.33 (0.56)	5.55 (0.94)	569.37 (96.34)
2	HYVs	1787	12.50 (0.70)	5.67 (0.32)	6.66 (0.37)	17.77 (0.99)	1744.40 (97.62)

(Figure in parentheses is percentage to total)

In HYVs per hectare total production of cashew nuts was 1787 kg; out of which 12.50 kg (0.70%) were kept for wage payment, 0.32 percent (5.67 kg) was consumed at home, 0.37 percent (6.66 kg) was given as gift to relatives and 0.99 percent (17.77 kg) was the losses in storage and drying. Out of total production, the marketable surplus in HYVs was observed to be 97.62 percent.

Among the local and HYVs of cashew the disposal pattern showed that the wage payment, gift to relatives, consume at home was comparatively more in local varieties than HYVs of cashew. Whereas losses during storage and drying and actual marketed quantity were seen to be higher in HYVs due to uniformity in size of nuts the buyers preferred HYVs cashew nut in the market.

Preference of marketing channels by cashew growers

The major portion of the cashew nuts reaches to the consumer in the form of the kernels and cashew nut shell oil (CNSL) after processing. However marketing channels are limited only up to the point of processing (that is the factory gate). The cashew growers in the south Konkan region area sold their produce through different market intermediates depending upon their scale of production and monetary needs.

Cashew growers were found to dispose off their produce through five different marketing channels. Majority of the farmers sold the raw cashew nuts through village traders in the nearby markets. The five major marketing channels were observed in the South Konkan region for marketing of raw cashew nut is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Marketing Channels

Channel I:	Grower → Village merchant → Wholesaler → processor
Channel II:	Grower → Itinerant Merchant → Factory agent → processor
Channel III:	Grower → Village merchant → processor
Channel IV:	Grower → Wholesaler → processor
Channel V:	Grower → processor

The distribution of cashew growers according to marketing channels followed and quantity sold by the growers was worked out and given in Table 3.

Table 3: Marketing Channels followed and quantity sold through different channels

Sr. No.	Particular	Ratnagiri		Sindhudurg	
		No. of cashew grower followed this channel	Quantity sold (kg)	No. of cashew grower followed this channel	Quantity sold (kg)
1	Channel I	43 (47.78)	61200 (36.36)	34 (33.01)	54745 (35.51)
2	Channel II	18 (20.00)	10800 (6.42)	19 (18.45)	13756 (8.92)
3	Channel III	16 (17.78)	5130 (3.05)	17 (16.50)	4396 (2.85)
4	Channel IV	27 (30.00)	67200 (39.92)	24 (23.30)	51270 (33.26)
5	Channel V	12 (13.33)	24000 (14.26)	9 (8.74)	29997 (19.46)
	Total	90	168330 (100.00)	80	154169 (100.00)

(Figure in parentheses is percentage to total)

It is observed from the Table 3 that the cashew grower sold the produce to the village trader in nearby village or in weekly market and consequently it reached to the processor. Therefore the first channel was found to be more popular in the South Konkan region as 43 growers (47.78%) in Ratnagiri district and 34 growers (33.01%) in Sindhudurg district sold their 36.36 percent and 35.51 percent produce through this channel, respectively., In case of channel II, growers sold their 20 percent and 18.45 percent of produce to itinerant merchant as mediator between producer and factory agent in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district. This channel was the second popular channel in Sindhudurg district and third in Ratnagiri district. In the third channel, village merchant act as mediator between grower and processor. This channel was found to be utilized by the growers, 17.78% to 16.50% of grower were used this channel. However, in the IVth marketing channel the grower himself brought the produce to the market place and sold to the wholesaler as mediator between grower and processor. 30.00 percent and 23.50 percent of growers from Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district sold their produce through this channel. In channel V th, some of the large cashew growers themselves took the produce to the processing point and sold directly to the processor. Through this channel 13.33 percent of cases growers from Ratnagiri district and 8.74 percent growers from Sindhudurg district sold their 14.26 percent and 19.46 percent produce respectively.

The pattern of disposal of cashew among the channels indicated that the quantity of produce marketed through channel IV was maximum 67200 kg (39.92%) followed by channel I (36.36%), channel V (14.26%), channel II (6.42%) and channel III (3.05%) in Ratnagiri district. Similar trend was found in Sindhudurg district except channel I show maximum contribution.

Marketing cost incurred by the producers
In the marketing of agricultural produce, every market functionary engaged in the expenses for preparation of produce for marketing. The drying, packing, transport, loading and unloading are the important items of marketing cost for raw cashew nuts. The per quintal marketing cost incurred by the grower of South Konkan region is given in Table 4.

Marketing cost of grower is estimated when the produce was sold through different intermediaries. In Ratnagiri district, when cashew nuts were sold through village trader the major item of cost was transportation (Rs. 12.48/qt) followed by drying (Rs. 9.97/qt), loading unloading (Rs. 6.63/qt) packing (Rs. 6.06/qt) and miscellaneous (Rs. 3.25/qt). Whereas, when the produce was sold through wholesaler, the major item of cost was transportation (Rs. 15.48/qt) followed by drying (Rs. 9.97/qt), loading unloading (Rs. 7.15/qt) g, packing (Rs. 7.06/qt) and miscellaneous (Rs. 3.30/qt). When cashew nut sold directly to processor by cashew grower in Ratnagiri district, the transportation cost was the highest cost than other item of cost accounting 36.22 percent of total marketing cost. The other cost item accounting Rs. 9.97/qt, Rs. 7.15/qt, Rs. 7.06/qt and Rs. 3.24/qt for drying, loading unloading, packing and miscellaneous respectively. It was indicated form the table that, in Ratnagiri district per quintal cost of marketing was incurred highest when grower sold his produce directly to the processor, this was due to the processing units were limited and away from the production area.

Table 4: Per quintal marketing cost incurred by cashew grower (Rs.)

Sr. No.	Item cost	Ratnagiri district			Sindhudurg district		
		Cost incurred while selling to			Cost incurred while selling to		
		VM	WS	PF	VM	WS	PF
1	Drying	9.97 (25.97)	9.97 (23.21)	9.97 (23.19)	9.74 (26.77)	9.74 (21.88)	9.74 (21.42)
2	Packaging	6.06 (15.79)	7.06 (16.43)	7.06 (16.42)	5.89 (16.19)	7.89 (17.72)	7.89 (17.35)
3	Transportation	12.48 (32.51)	15.48 (36.03)	15.57 (36.22)	10.23 (28.11)	14.82 (33.29)	14.96 (32.90)
4	Loading & unloading	6.63 (17.27)	7.15 (16.64)	7.15 (16.63)	7.05 (19.37)	8.12 (18.24)	8.12 (17.86)
5	Miscellaneous	3.25 (8.47)	3.3 (7.68)	3.24 (7.54)	3.48 (9.56)	3.95 (8.87)	4.76 (10.47)
	Total	38.39 (100.00)	42.96 (100.00)	42.99 (100.00)	36.39 (100.00)	44.52 (100.00)	45.47 (100.00)

(Figure in parentheses indicate percent to total cost of respective column)

In case of Sindhudurg district, the per quintal marketing cost incurred by the grower was worked out to be Rs. 36.39 when it was sold through village trader, and it was estimated to Rs. 44.52/qt and Rs. 45.47/qt when sold through wholesaler and directly to processor. When the produce was sold through village trader in Sindhudurg district, the major item of cost was Rs. 10.23 /qt for transportation accounting 28.11 percent of total marketing cost. Which was followed by followed by drying (Rs. 9.74/qt), loading unloading (Rs. 7.05/qt) packing (Rs. 5.89/qt) and miscellaneous (Rs. 3.48/qt). Whereas, when the produce was sold by Sindhudurg farmers through wholesaler, the major item of cost was transportation (Rs. 14.42/qt) followed by drying (Rs. 9.74/qt), loading unloading (Rs. 8.12/qt), packing (Rs. 7.89/qt) and miscellaneous (Rs. 3.95/qt). When cashew nut sold directly to processor by cashew grower in Sindhudurg district, the transportation cost was the highest cost than other item of cost accounting 32.90 percent of total marketing cost. The other cost item accounting Rs. 9.74/qt, Rs. 8.12/qt, Rs. 7.89/qt and Rs. 4.76/qt for drying, loading unloading, packing and miscellaneous respectively. It was indicated form the table that, in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg

districts, per quintal cost of marketing was highest when grower sold his produce directly to the processor, this was due to the processing units were limited and away from the production area.

Marketing cost incurred by various market intermediaries

Cashew nut was routed through various market intermediaries like village traders, itinerant merchant, wholesaler, and factory agents. The marketing channel was traced up to processing factory and hence the same was considering as an end consumer. Marketing cost incurred by various market intermediaries is given in Table 5.

Marketing cost incurred by Itinerant merchant

In the process of marketing of raw cashew nuts, the village itinerant merchant was an important intermediary in both the district who purchase produce on door steps of the grower and sold to the factory agent directly. In this process he incurred per quintal total cost of marketing in both the district are similar and range from Rs. 42.90/qt to Rs. 41.68/qt. Out of that the major cost was transportation ranges from 74.69 Percent to 75.46 percent of total marketing cost.

Marketing cost incurred by Village merchant

The village merchant is also another important market intermediary in the marketing of raw cashew nuts who purchased produce by staying in the village market or weekly market in the tahasil and sold it to the wholesaler or directly to the processor. He incurred costs on various items such as storage, storage losses, electricity, transportation, packing, loading and unloading, licensing fees etc. Per quintal marketing cost incurred by village merchant is shown in Table 5.

The total cost incurred by the village merchant in transaction of raw cashew nut amounted to Rs. 64.96/qt in Ratnagiri district whereas it was amounted to Rs. 71.26/ qt. Among the various items of costs, transportation cost is the major cost item contributing 19.44 percent of total cost in Ratnagiri district and 11.54 percent of total cost in Sindhudurg district.

This was followed by packing cost (18.83% & 18.81%), storage (13.5% &11.68%), storage loss (12.88% &12.10%), loading and unloading (12.10% &9.78%) and labour cost (9.25% & 8.90%). It is revealed that, in case of marketing cost with respect to village merchant in both the district, the transportation cost was found to be more as compared to other costs items because of long distance for transaction of the produce.

Table 5: Per quintal marketing cost incurred by various intermediaries (Rs.)

Sr. No	Particular	Ratnagiri district					Sindhudurg district				
		ITM	VM	WS	FA	overall	ITM	VM	WS	FA	Overall
1	Cost of storage	0.00	8.48 (13.05)	9.35 (11.65)	9.45 (14.97)	5.36 (9.28)	0.00	8.32 (11.68)	8.54 (10.73)	8.8 (12.29)	5.23 (8.58)
2	Storage losses	0.77 (1.79)	8.37 (12.88)	6.32 (7.88)	4.21 (6.67)	4.72 (8.17)	0.68 (1.63)	8.62 (12.10)	7.33 (9.21)	7.5 (10.47)	5.31 (8.70)
3	Electricity charges	0.00	7.98 (12.28)	8.01 (9.98)	9.1 (14.42)	4.98 (8.62)	0.00	8.33 (11.69)	8.55 (10.75)	7.63 (10.65)	5.10 (8.36)
4	Transportation cost	32.04 (74.69)	12.63 (19.44)	9.34 (11.64)	5.62 (8.90)	19.11 (33.06)	31.45 (75.46)	13.21 (18.54)	8.65 (10.87)	7.25 (10.12)	18.91 (30.98)
5	Loading unloading charges	5.62 (13.10)	7.86 (12.10)	7.9 (9.85)	8.88 (14.07)	7.10 (12.28)	5.03 (12.07)	6.97 (9.78)	7.25 (9.11)	9.33 (13.03)	6.55 (10.73)
6	Weighing charges	0.00	0.56 (0.86)	1.3 (1.62)	1.32 (2.09)	0.50 (0.87)	0.00	0.5 (0.70)	1.5 (1.89)	2.15 (3.00)	0.63 (1.02)
7	Packaging cost	0.00	12.23 (18.83)	21.2 (26.42)	11.5 (18.22)	8.34 (14.43)	0.00	13.12 (18.41)	17.25 (21.68)	12.6 (17.59)	8.55 (14.01)
8	Labour cost	4.47 (10.42)	6.01 (9.25)	8.62 (10.74)	7.31 (11.58)	5.83 (10.09)	4.52 (10.84)	6.34 (8.90)	8.5 (10.68)	8.32 (11.62)	6.14 (10.06)
9	Shop rent	0.00	0.52 (0.80)	1.6 (1.99)	2.36 (3.74)	0.63 (1.10)	0.00	0.35 (0.49)	2.22 (2.79)	3.54 (4.94)	0.82 (1.34)
10	Tax & license fee	0.00	0.32 (0.49)	6.6 (8.23)	3.37 (5.34)	1.21 (2.09)	0.00	5.5 (7.72)	9.78 (12.29)	4.5 (6.28)	3.80 (6.22)
	Total	42.9 (100.)	64.96 (100)	80.24 (100.)	63.12 (100.)	57.79 (100.00)	41.68 (100)	71.26 (100.00)	79.57 (100)	71.62 (100)	61.02 (100.)

(Figure in parentheses indicate percent to total cost of respective column)

Marketing cost incurred by the wholesaler

The total marketing cost incurred by wholesaler in Ratnagiri district amounted to Rs. 80.24/qt. out of that packaging cost have maximum share (26.42%) followed by transportation cost (11.64%), labour (10.74%), Electricity (9.98%), taxes (8.23%) storage cost (7.88%), and loading unloading (9.85%). However in Sindhudurg district the marketing cost incurred by wholesaler amounted to Rs. 79.75/qt, out of which packaging cost have maximum share (21.68%) followed by taxes (12.29%), transportation cost (10.87%), Electricity (10.75%), storage cost (10.73%), labour

(10.68%), and loading unloading (9.11%).

Marketing cost incurred by the factory agent

The factory agents were in close contact with processing factory and they were doing business on behalf of cashew processing factory owners. The per quintal total marketing cost incurred by factory agent in Ratnagiri district was Rs. 63.12. The major item of cost were packaging (18.22%), storage cost (14.97%), loading unloading (14.7%), electricity charges (14.42%), labour (11.58%), transportation (8.90), storage losses (6.67%) and taxes and

license fee (5.34%). Similarly the per quintal total marketing cost incurred by factory agent in Sindhudurg district was Rs. 71.62. The major item of cost were packaging (17.59%), loading unloading (13.03%), storage cost (12.29%), labour (11.62%), electricity charges (10.65%), storage losses (10.47%), transportation (10.12%), and taxes and license fee(6.28%).

Among the various marketing intermediaries the village merchant takes maximum risk associated with uncertainty in marketing of raw cashew for loss due to price crash during peak harvesting season. Whereas wholesalers and factory agent were at minimum risk as they negotiates cashew trade between the village merchants and producers and sold their produce directly to the factory for further processing.

Price spread in raw cashew marketing
The intermediaries involved in the marketing of raw cashew nuts render variety of services in view to earn some sort of profit. The price spread in different channels of marketing in Ratnagiri district is presented in Table 6. The table revealed that the producer share in consumer rupees was highest in (99.69%) channel V followed by channel IV (98.32%), channel I &III (91.86%), and lowest being in channel II (84.60%). This was due to highest market margin in channel II accounted to 14.51 percent.

Table 6: Price spread in different channels of Marketing in Ratnagiri district (Rs/qt)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Channel I		Channel II		Channel III		Channel IV		Channel V	
		Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	%
1	Price received by grower	12866.67	92.14	11833.33	84.74	12866.67	92.14	13773.67	98.63	13965	100.00
2	Marketing cost of grower	38.39	0.27	19.28	0.14	38.39	0.27	42.96	0.31	42.99	0.31
3	Net price received by grower	12828.28	91.86	11814.05	84.60	12828.28	91.86	13730.71	98.32	13922.01	99.69
4	Purchase price of itinerant	0.00	0.00	11833.33	84.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Cost incurred by itinerant	0.00	0.00	42.19	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	Profit margin of itinerant	0.00	0.00	1557.81	11.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Purchase price of village merchant	12866.67	92.14	0.00	0.00	12866.67	92.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Cost incurred by village merchant	64.96	0.47	0.00	0.00	64.96	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	Profit margin of village merchant	859.37	6.15	0.00	0.00	1033.37	7.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Purchase price of Wholesaler	13791	98.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13773.67	98.63	0.00	0.00
11	Cost incurred by Wholesaler	80.24	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.24	0.57	0.00	0.00
12	Profit margin of Wholesaler	93.76	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	111.09	0.80	0.00	0.00
13	Purchase price of Factory agent	0.00	0.00	13433.33	96.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	Cost incurred by Factory agent	0.00	0.00	63.12	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
15	Profit margin of Factory agent	0.00	0.00	468.55	3.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
16	Processor purchase price	13965	100.00	13965	100.00	13965	100.00	13965	100.00	13965	100.00
17	Total market margin	953.13	6.83	2026.36	14.51	1033.37	7.40	111.09	0.80	0.00	0.00
18	Producer share in processor rupee (%)	91.86		84.60		91.86		98.32		99.69	

Table 7: Price spread in different channels of Marketing in Sindhudurg district

Sr. No.	Particulars	Channel I		Channel II		Channel III		Channel IV		Channel V	
		Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	%	Rs.	
1	Price received by grower	13000.00	93.07	11500.00	82.35	13000.00	93.07	13000.00	93.07	13968	100.00
2	Marketing cost of grower	36.39	0.26	13.22	0.09	36.39	0.26	36.39	0.26	45.47	0.33
3	Net price received by grower	12963.61	92.81	11486.78	82.25	12963.61	92.81	12963.61	92.81	13922.53	99.67
4	Purchase price of itinerant	0.00	0.00	11500.00	82.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Cost incurred by itinerant	0.00	0.00	41.68	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	Profit margin of itinerant	0.00	0.00	2224.99	15.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Purchase price of village merchant	13000.00	93.07	0.00	0.00	13000.00	93.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Cost incurred by village merchant	120.76	0.86	0.00	0.00	120.76	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	Profit margin of village merchant	692.61	4.96	0.00	0.00	847.24	6.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Purchase price of Wholesaler	13813.37	98.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13813.37	98.89	0.00	0.00
11	Cost incurred by Wholesaler	79.57	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	79.57	0.57	0.00	0.00
12	Profit margin of Wholesaler	75.06	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.06	0.54	0.00	0.00
13	Purchase price of Factory agent	0.00	0.00	13766.67	98.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	Cost incurred by Factory agent	0.00	0.00	71.62	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00.	0.00
15	Profit margin of Factory agent	0.00	0.00	129.71	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
16	Processor purchase price	13968	100.00	13968	100.02	13968	100.00	13968	100.00	13968	100.00
17	Total market margin	767.67	5.50	2354.70	16.86	847.24	6.07	75.06	0.54	0.00	
18	Producer share in processor rupee (%)	92.81		82.24		92.81		92.81		99.67	

Corresponding per quintal net price received by the producer was highest in case of channel V (Rs. 13922) due to direct sell to processor and only Rs. 42.99 per quintal was incurred for transportation charges to producer.

In case of Sindhudurg district Table 7 showed marketing margin and price spread of agencies and it was revealed from the table 7 that the producer share in consumer rupees was maximum (99.67%) in channel V followed by channel IV (98.32%), channel I, III &IV (92.81%), and lowest being in channel II (82.24%). This was due to highest market

margin in channel II accounted to 16.86 percent.

It is reveled from the Table 6 and 7 that more or less same trend was observed in different marketing channels of cashew in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district of Konkan region. The market margin increases with the increase in number of intermediaries. However, the channel in which village merchant was involved was most popular due to assured payment of immediate financial needs of cashew grower and to reduce risk in price fluctuations. Some of the cashew growers, who were well to do and aware about the price given by processors for raw cashew nuts sold their produce to processors. Selling directly to processor said to be efficient marketing channel because market margin was nil. However only 8 to 11 percent of grower found to be use this channel. The most of cashew growers in the South Konkan region were small holders, hence, produce of cashew nuts was not large enough for distance marketing, so

that village merchant is most important market intermediary for small cashew holders and they were prompt dealing with the cashew growers.

Marketing constraints opined by the cashew growers
The important cashew marketing constraints in the South Konkan region were identified and presented in the Table 8. It is observed from the Table 8 that, 81.18 percent of cashew growers expressed the problem of distance location of processing units, followed by prices fluctuations (74.71%), no proper cashew apple processing policy (73.52%), malpractices by village /itinerant merchant (64.12%), non-availability of grading facility (55.29%), unaware about market prices (54.12%), non-remunerative prices of raw cashew nuts (48.82%), high marketing and transport cost (34.71%), inadequate market facilities (27.06%) and non-availability of packing material (23.53%).

Table 8: Marketing constraints experienced by cashew growers

	Constraints	N= 170	Percent
1	Distance location of processing units	138	81.18
2	Price fluctuations	127	74.71
3	No proper policy regarding cashew apple processing	125	73.52
4	Malpractices by village traders / itinerants	109	64.12
5	Non availability of grading facility	94	55.29
6	Non remunerative price	83	48.82
7	High marketing and transport cost	59	34.71
8	Unaware about market price	92	54.12
9	Inadequate market infrastructure	46	27.06
10	Non availability of packaging material	40	23.53

Conclusion
Among the local and HYVs of cashew nuts the disposal pattern showed that the kind payment, gift to relatives, consume at home was comparatively more in local varieties than HYVs of cashew. Whereas losses during storage and drying and actual marketed quantity were higher in HYVs due to uniformity in size of raw cashew nuts the buyers preferred HYVs cashew nut in the market. Cashew nut growers from the South Konkan region were disposing off their produce through five different marketing channels. Majority of the farmers sold the raw cashew nuts through village traders in the nearby markets. In South Konkan region per quintal cost of marketing was incurred highest when grower sold his produce directly to the processor, this was due to the processing units were limited and away from the production area. Among the various marketing intermediaries the village merchant takes maximum risk associated with uncertainty in marketing of raw cashew nuts for loss due to price crash during peak harvesting season. In the various items of costs of raw cashew nut marketing, among various market intermediaries, the transportation cost is the major cost item contributing 30 to 33 percent of total cost in South Konkan region. The price spread in different channels of marketing in South Konkan region revealed that the producer share in consumer rupees was highest in (99.69%) channel V followed by channel IV (98.32%), channel I &III (91.86%), and lowest being in channel II (84.60%). This was due to highest market margin in channel II accounted to 14.51 percent. The channel in which village merchant was involved was most popular due to assured payment of immediate financial needs of cashew grower

and to reduce risk in price fluctuations.

References
1. John CR. Garrett's Ranking Analysis of Various Clinical Bovine Mastitis Control Constraints in Villupuram District of Tamil Nadu. J Agric Vet Sci (IOSR-JAVS). 2014;7(4):62-64.
2. Dalvi VD. Economics of production, marketing and processing of cashewnut in Sindhudurg district. Unpublished M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis approved by Dr. B. S. K. K. V., Dapoli; c1989.
3. Hassan A, Raghuram P. Cashew processing and marketing. Agric Mktg. 1987;30:13-19.
4. Ipte PG, Borude SG. Economics of marketing and processing of cashewnut in Ratnagiri/Sindhudurg district (Maharashtra Stat). Cashew Causerie. 1982;4:22-27.
5. Gupta SP, Prasant DS. Marketing and processing of cashewnut in Goa state: An economic analysis. Agric Mktg. 2004;47:20-29.
6. Guledgudda SS, Shripad V, Olekar JN. Economics of banana cultivation and its marketing in Haveri district of Karnataka state. Indian J Agril Mktg. 2002;16(91):51-59.
7. Kulkarni SN. Production and marketing of grapes in Vijayapura district, Karnataka. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India); c1989.
8. Nagesh AR. Investment in production and marketing of cashew in Karnataka. An economic analysis. Unpublished M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis submitted to University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; c1990.

9. Nagraj GN, Narayanswami TC, Bhaskar V. Production and marketing constraints in potato. Agric Banker. 1999;23(1):1-3.
10. Patil HN. Marketing of Alphonso Mangoes in Maharashtra. J Maharashtra Agric Univ. 1989;14:244-245.
11. Rajur BC. Production and marketing performance of chilli in Karnataka – an economic analysis. Ph.D. thesis submitted to University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; c2007.
12. Shivaraya B. Production, marketing and processing of redgram in Gulbarga district of Karnataka: An economic Analysis. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India); c2000.
13. Sene A. Agrobusiness cashewnuts in Casamanace (Senegal), strength constraints and industrialization prospects. Europian Sci J. 2019;15:363-377.