



**Research Paper**

# Economic analysis of pineapple production in Sindhudurg district of Maharashtra

■ **SHILPA MATHEW, S.S. WADKAR AND P.J. KSHIRSAGAR**

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :

**SHILPA MATHEW**  
Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, RATNAGIRI (M.S.) INDIA  
Email: [sagartarang@rediffmail.com](mailto:sagartarang@rediffmail.com)

**Paper History :**

Received : 11.05.2017;

Revised : 08.08.2017;

Accepted : 15.08.2017

**ABSTRACT :** Fruits are nature's wonderful gift to mankind. Pineapple is an important commercial fruit crop with high export value. In this paper, an attempt has been made to study the economic analysis of pineapple production in Sindhudurg district of Maharashtra pertained to the years 2013-16 with a view to analyse resource use pattern, cost and returns and farm business analysis. The study was based on the primary data collected from tenant growers of Dodamarg tahsil in Sindhudurg district. Per hectare physical input utilization pattern indicated that there was higher utilization of inputs such as hired labour, fertilizers and plant protection chemicals. Per hectare cost of cultivation and the net returns amounted to Rs. 588220 and Rs. 993511 for the three years with an overall benefit cost ratio of 2.68. The farm business analysis indicated that the pineapple cultivation was highly profitable in all the three years.

**KEY WORDS :** Pineapple, Cost, Returns, Resource use, Farm business analysis

**HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER :** Mathew, Shilpa, Wadkar, S.S. and Kshirsagar, P.J. (2017). Economic analysis of pineapple production in Sindhudurg district of Maharashtra. *Internat. Res. J. Agric. Eco. & Stat.*, **8** (2) : 351-356, DOI : 10.15740/HAS/IRJAES/8.2/351-356.

## INTRODUCTION :

Agriculture is demographically the broadest economic sector and plays a significant role in the overall socio-economic fabric of India. India has witnessed voluminous increase in horticulture production over the last few years. Fruits and vegetables account for nearly 90 per cent of the total horticultural production in the country. Fruits are nature's wonderful gift to mankind. Production and consumption of high quality fruits allow us to maintain a healthy, balanced, daily diet. Commercial importance of fruits have been increased all over the world as they contribute significantly to the country's economy besides their social and nutritional importance. Fruit production plays an important role in employment,

income generation, export and meets household's nutritional security. Pineapple (*Ananas comosus* L.) is one of the commercially important fruit crops of India. In addition to serving as a food, with its natural sweetness the pineapple has served in history as a symbol and an artistic motif. It is also used as an ornamental symbolising, welcome and opulence. The rarity, reputation, visual attractiveness have made pineapple as an ultimate exotic fruit. Pineapple is grown and yields the best in areas with relatively uniform climate year around. Current production remains restricted to the tropical regions of the world. Presently the total global production in the world is 23 MMT which is produced by approximately 80 countries around the world. In India, the leading pineapple producing states are West Bengal (320 thousand tonnes)

followed by Assam (290.21 thousand tonnes), Kerala (255.90 thousand tonnes) and Karnataka (158.12 thousand tonnes). Whereas the productivity is highest for Karnataka (62.49t/ha) followed by West Bengal (29.54 t/ha), Bihar (27.64 t/ha) and Kerala (27.36 t/ha). (Source-Horticultural statistics At A Glance 2015). Maharashtra is one of the prominent horticulture producing state and largest producer of fruits in India. The area under total fruits in the state was (1565 thousand ha) with a production of (13457.9 thousand MT) and productivity (8.6 MT/ha) for the year 2013-14 (Source-National Horticulture Database-2014). Pineapple cultivation and production in Maharashtra is very less compared to other producing states of India.

The specific objectives of the study have been undertaken as follows:

- To assess the existing pattern of resource use in pineapple.
- To estimate cost, returns and profitability of pineapple cultivation.
- To study farm business analysis for pineapple cultivation.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS :

For the present study Dodamarg tahsil of the Sindhudurg district was selected purposively as pineapple cultivation is concentrated in the study area and area under this crop is rapidly increasing since the last seven years. The data required for the study were collected by survey method. The detail information needed for the research work was collected from the total available 20 tenant growers with an average per farm leased in land area of 6.91 ha. All the tenant growers were interviewed personally with the help of schedule specially designed for the purpose. The information and data for the present study are pertained to the years 2013-16.

### Economics of pineapple production:

The economics of pineapple production for the three years was worked out using the A, B and C cost measures followed by the Commission of Agricultural Cost and Prices (CACP). The A, B and C measures of costs and their components are: Cost A<sub>1</sub>, Cost A<sub>2</sub>, Cost B<sub>1</sub>, Cost B<sub>2</sub>, Cost C<sub>1</sub>, Cost C<sub>2</sub> and Cost C<sub>3</sub>.

Cost A<sub>1</sub>: Actual paid out cost by the owner cultivator for items like hired labour, hired machinery, suckers, manures, fertilizers, plant protection chemicals, irrigation

charges, electricity charges, depreciation on implements and farm buildings and interest on working capital.

Cost A<sub>2</sub>: Cost A<sub>1</sub>+ rent paid for leased in land.

Cost B<sub>1</sub>: Cost A<sub>1</sub> + interest on fixed capital.

Cost B<sub>2</sub>: Cost B<sub>1</sub> + rental value of owned land+ rent paid for leased in land.

Cost C<sub>1</sub>: Cost B<sub>1</sub>+ imputed value of family labour.

Cost C<sub>2</sub>: Cost B<sub>2</sub> + imputed value of family labour.

Cost C<sub>3</sub>: Cost C<sub>2</sub> + supervision charges.

Since the entire cultivation was carried out in leased in land, the Cost A<sub>2</sub>, Cost B<sub>2</sub>, Cost C<sub>2</sub> and Cost C<sub>3</sub> measures of cost were used for the computation of per hectare cost of cultivation of pineapple.

### Farm business analysis :

The following measures of farm income were used to estimate the income efficiency of selected farms.

Farm business income = Gross income – Cost A<sub>2</sub>

Farm investment income= Gross income-(Cost A<sub>2</sub>+Value of family human labour)

Family labour income = Gross income – cost B<sub>2</sub>

Net income = Gross income-cost C<sub>3</sub>.

## RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS :

The results and data analysis from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads.

### Economics of pineapple production:

*Per hectare input utilization for pineapple cultivation:*

A study of resource use pattern helps to determine the profitability of crop enterprise. The per hectare physical input utilization in pineapple farms for the first, second and third years are presented in Table 1. It is observed from Table 1 that the total labour days utilized for first, second and third years was 800.90 out of which 744.47 days were found to be of hired labour and remaining 56.43 days were constituted by family labour. Since the tenant growers were staying without family in the study area, there was no female labour participation and therefore, the total family labour was constituted by male only. A total of 1387.61 kg, 329.06 kg and 1348.38 kg of N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O fertilizers were used for the three years. While comparing level of input utilization in the three years, it can be concluded that inputs like suckers and manures were used lesser than the recommended

level. While in case of fertilizers, there was over utilization in first and second years while the usage was comparatively lesser in the third year. Fungicides and weedicides were also used slightly higher than the recommended dosage. The growth regulator application was in par with the recommendation. Since in second and third year, the fruit bearing is from ratoon of original plant, there was no further planting material utilization in the above years.

The per hectare labour days utilized decreased in second and third year compared to first year since many labour intensive farm establishment operations were only in the first year. Overall per hectare labour utilization was seemed to be higher for the sample farms.

### Cost of cultivation of pineapple:

The per hectare cost of cultivation of pineapple was worked out using the standard cost concepts explained in methodology. It is observed from the Table 2 that the

total cost of cultivation, Cost C<sub>3</sub> for the first, second and third year was worked out to be Rs. 588220. The item wise maximum cost was incurred on hired labour (34.41%), followed by cost of suckers (12.97%), fertilizers (6.37%), machine hours (4.95%) and manures (3.96%). The per cent of cost of other inputs on total cost of cultivation were, plant protection chemicals (1.99%), irrigation charges (1.43%), electricity charges (0.61%) and growth regulatory hormone (0.21%). The per cent share on interest on working capital was 5.33 per cent and the rent paid for leased in land was about 4.20 per cent. The interest on fixed capital for the first year was higher since the cost of labour (machine and human labour) for establishment operations like land preparation, planting, digging, fencing were also included along with the cost of suckers and value of fixed assets of the cultivators. It is evident from the Table 2 that Cost A<sub>2</sub>, Cost B<sub>2</sub>, Cost C<sub>2</sub> and Cost C<sub>3</sub> were found to be higher in first year and comparatively lesser in second and third

**Table 1: Per hectare input utilization of pineapple**

| Sr.No. | Input                         | Unit   | 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | Total   |
|--------|-------------------------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1.     | <b>Hired labour</b>           |        |                      |                      |                      |         |
|        | Male                          | Days   | 184.81               | 141.13               | 114.26               | 440.20  |
|        | Female                        | Days   | 124.10               | 94.18                | 85.99                | 304.27  |
| 2.     | <b>Family labour</b>          |        |                      |                      |                      |         |
|        | Male                          | Days   | 20.24                | 20.49                | 15.70                | 56.43   |
|        | Female                        | Days   | -                    | -                    | -                    | -       |
| 3.     | <b>Total labour</b>           |        |                      |                      |                      |         |
|        | Male                          | Days   | 205.05               | 161.62               | 129.96               | 496.63  |
|        | Female                        | Days   | 124.10               | 94.18                | 85.99                | 304.27  |
|        | Total                         |        | 329.15               | 255.80               | 215.95               | 800.90  |
| 4.     | <b>Machine labour</b>         | Hrs    | 31.78                | -                    | -                    | 31.78   |
| 5.     | Suckers                       | No     | 19074                | -                    | -                    | 19074   |
| 6.     | Manures                       | tonnes | 19.46                | -                    | -                    | 19.46   |
| 7.     | <b>Fertilizer</b>             |        |                      |                      |                      |         |
|        | N                             | Kg     | 574.63               | 548.25               | 264.73               | 1387.61 |
|        | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | Kg     | 109.49               | 132.33               | 87.24                | 329.06  |
|        | K <sub>2</sub> O              | Kg     | 535.42               | 529.67               | 283.29               | 1348.38 |
| 8.     | Fungicides                    | Kg     | 2.91                 | 2.40                 | 1.79                 | 7.1     |
| 9.     | Weedicides                    | Kg     | 3.26                 | 3.12                 | 2.67                 | 9.05    |
| 10.    | Growth regulator              | Lit.   | 0.28                 | 0.32                 | 0.35                 | 0.95    |
| 11.    | Irrigation charges            | Rs.    | 2716                 | 2967                 | 2730                 | 8413    |
| 12.    | <b>Yield</b>                  |        |                      |                      |                      |         |
|        | Main produce                  | Qtls   | 264.40               | 286.93               | 191.01               | 742.34  |
|        | By-produce                    | No     | -                    | 40513                | 38685                | 79198   |

years. This was due to the labour intensive establishment operations and higher input usage in first year.

### Economics of pineapple production:

The data on cost and returns from pineapple is

presented in the Table 3. The selected tenant growers of the present study attained the first crop yield in the eleventh month after planting. The reason for the same was due to the climate and soil characteristics of the study area which favoured early maturation of the crop

**Table 2: Per hectare cost of cultivation of pineapple**

| Sr.No. | Particulars                                | 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | Total          |
|--------|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1.     | Hired labour                               |                      |                      |                      |                |
|        | Male                                       | 60433 (18.68)        | 46149 (31.75)        | 33776 (28.29)        | 140358 (23.86) |
|        | Female                                     | 25316 (7.82)         | 19213 (13.21)        | 17542 (14.69)        | 62071 (10.55)  |
| 2.     | Machine hrs.                               | 29174 (9.01)         | -                    | -                    | 29174 (4.95)   |
| 3.     | Suckers                                    | 76296 (23.58)        | -                    | -                    | 76296 (12.97)  |
| 4.     | Manures                                    | 23352 (7.21)         | -                    | -                    | 23352 (3.96)   |
| 5.     | Fertilizers                                |                      |                      |                      |                |
|        | N  | 3161(0.97)           | 3838 (2.64)          | 1853 (1.55)          | 8852 (1.50)    |
|        | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>              | 1204 (0.37)          | 1588 (1.09)          | 1047 (0.87)          | 3839 (0.65)    |
|        | K <sub>2</sub> O                           | 9638 (2.97)          | 9534 (6.55)          | 5666 (4.74)          | 24838 (4.22)   |
| 6.     | Plant protection chemicals                 | 4320 (1.33)          | 4074 (2.80)          | 3312 (2.77)          | 11706 (1.99)   |
| 7.     | Growth regulatory hormones                 | 373 (0.11)           | 426 (0.29)           | 465 (0.38)           | 1264 (0.21)    |
| 8.     | Irrigation charges                         | 2716 (0.83)          | 2967 (2.04)          | 2730 (2.28)          | 8413 (1.43)    |
| 9.     | Electricity charges                        | 1266 (0.39)          | 1205 (0.82)          | 1105 (0.92)          | 3576 (0.61)    |
|        | Input cost                                 | 237249 (73.33)       | 88994 (61.22)        | 67496 (56.53)        | 393739 (66.93) |
| 10.    | Depreciation on machinery and implements   | 9365 (2.89)          | 9365 (6.44)          | 9365 (7.84)          | 28095 (4.77)   |
| 11.    | Interest on working capital @ 12 per cent. | 12615(3.89)          | 10679 (7.34)         | 8099 (6.78)          | 31393 (5.33)   |
| 12.    | Rent paid for leased in land               | 7638 (2.36)          | 7638 (5.25)          | 9464 (7.92)          | 24740 (4.20)   |
|        | Cost A <sub>2</sub>                        | 266867 (82.49)       | 116676 (80.27)       | 94424 (6.78)         | 477967 (81.25) |
| 13.    | Interest on fixed capital @ 10 per cent    | 26284 (8.12)         | 13072 (8.99)         | 13072 (10.94)        | 52428 (8.91)   |
|        | Cost B <sub>2</sub>                        | 293151(90.62)        | 129748 (89.26)       | 107496 (90.04)       | 530395 (90.16) |
| 14.    | Family human labour                        |                      |                      |                      |                |
|        | Male                                       | 6619 (2.04)          | 6700(4.60)           | 5133(4.30)           | 18452 (3.13)   |
|        | Female                                     | -                    | -                    | -                    | -              |
|        | Cost C <sub>2</sub>                        | 299770 (92.66)       | 136448 (93.87)       | 112629 (94.34)       | 548847 (93.30) |
| 15.    | Supervision charges                        | 23725 (7.33)         | 8899 ( 6.12)         | 6749 (5.65)          | 39373 (6.69)   |
| 16.    | Cost C <sub>3</sub>                        | 323495(100.00)       | 145347(100.00)       | 119378(100.00)       | 588220(100.00) |
|        | Per quintal cost                           | 1223                 | 224                  | 220                  | 579            |
| 17.    | Yield                                      |                      |                      |                      |                |
|        | Main produce (q)                           | 264.40               | 286.93               | 191.01               | 742.34         |
|        | By-produce (No)                            | -                    | 40513                | 38685                | 79198          |
| 18.    | Total returns (Rs.)                        |                      |                      |                      |                |
|        | Main produce (q)                           | 462700               | 559514               | 401121               | 1423335        |
|        | By-produce (No)                            | -                    | 81026                | 77370                | 158396         |
|        | Total                                      | 462700               | 640540               | 478491               | 1581731        |

Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage to cost C<sub>3</sub>

along with proper cultivation practices followed by the pineapple tenant growers. The total gross income amounted to Rs. 1581731. The total net returns for the three years at Cost A<sub>2</sub> was Rs. 1103764, Cost B<sub>2</sub> was Rs. 1051336, Cost C<sub>2</sub> Rs. 1032884 and Cost C<sub>3</sub> Rs. 993511. The net returns at Cost C<sub>3</sub> was Rs. 139205 in first year, Rs. 495193 in second year and Rs. 359113 in third year. The net returns were found to be higher in second and third years due to the lesser cost incurred in the above years. The overall benefit-cost ratio was 2.68. The first and second ratoon enabled the cultivators to attain higher returns when compared to the first year production.

### Farm business analysis :

It is observed from the Table 4, the various income measures computed on per hectare basis for ascertaining the profitability of pineapple cultivation in the three years. The gross income from main produce and by-produce was Rs. 1423335 and Rs. 158396. The total farm business income and farm investment income amounted to Rs.

1085312 and Rs. 1085312. The family labour income was worked out to be Rs. 169549, Rs. 510792 and Rs. 370995 in the three years, respectively. The total net income was amounted to Rs. 993511. The four income measures attained maximum values in second year. This was due to the higher yield procured from first ratoon and better market price availed by farmers.

### Conclusion :

Overall per hectare labour utilization was seemed to be higher for the sample farms. The per hectare cost of cultivation, Cost C<sub>3</sub> was worked out to Rs. 588220 for the three years out of which the total labour cost accounted to 42.51 per cent and remaining 57.49 per cent was constituted by material cost. The net returns was calculated to be Rs. 993511 with an overall benefit cost ratio of 2.68. The total gross return was amounted to be Rs. 1581731 for the three years. The study revealed that pineapple cultivation was highly profitable for the farmers at all costs *i.e.* at Cost A<sub>2</sub>, Cost B<sub>2</sub>, Cost C<sub>2</sub> and Cost C<sub>3</sub> particularly in second and third year. The high

**Table 3: Per hectare economics of pineapple production**

| Sr. No. | Particulars                | 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | Total   |
|---------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1.      | Gross returns              | 462700               | 640540               | 478491               | 1581731 |
| 2.      | Costs                      |                      |                      |                      |         |
|         | Cost A <sub>2</sub>        | 266867               | 116676               | 94424                | 477967  |
|         | Cost B <sub>2</sub>        | 293151               | 129748               | 107496               | 530395  |
|         | Cost C <sub>2</sub>        | 299770               | 136448               | 112629               | 548847  |
|         | Cost C <sub>3</sub>        | 323495               | 145347               | 119378               | 588220  |
| 3.      | Net returns                |                      |                      |                      |         |
|         | Cost A <sub>2</sub>        | 195833               | 523864               | 384067               | 1103764 |
|         | Cost B <sub>2</sub>        | 169549               | 510792               | 370995               | 1051336 |
|         | Cost C <sub>2</sub>        | 162930               | 504092               | 365862               | 1032884 |
|         | Cost C <sub>3</sub>        | 139205               | 495193               | 359113               | 993511  |
| 4.      | Benefit-cost ratio         | 1.43                 | 4.41                 | 4.00                 |         |
|         | Overall benefit-cost ratio |                      | 2.68                 |                      |         |

**Table 4: Farm business analysis**

| Sr.No. | Particulars               | 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | Total   |
|--------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
|        | Gross income-main produce | 462700               | 559514               | 401121               | 1423335 |
|        | Gross income-by-produce   | -                    | 81026                | 77370                | 158396  |
|        | Total                     | 462700               | 640540               | 478491               | 1581731 |
| 1.     | Farm business income      | 195833               | 523864               | 384067               | 1103764 |
| 2.     | Farm investment income    | 189214               | 517164               | 378934               | 1085312 |
| 3.     | Family labour income      | 169549               | 510792               | 370995               | 1051336 |
| 4.     | Net income                | 139205               | 495193               | 359113               | 993511  |

consumer demand and good quality of produce favoured the farmers in securing better price for the fruits throughout the production period. The benefit-cost ratio was worked out to be 1.43 in first year, 4.41 in second year and 4.00 in the third year. The overall benefit-cost ratio was 2.68. The first and second ratoon enabled the pineapple growers to attain higher returns when compared to the first year production. The four measures of income showed a rising trend in second and third year with respect to first year. This was mainly due to the absence of farm establishment operations especially land preparation, digging and planting in second and third years. The above results indicated the profitability of horticultural fruit production and marketing.

Authors' affiliations:

S.S. WADKAR AND P.J. KSHIRSAGAR, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, RATNAGIRI (M.S.) INDIA

## LITERATURE CITED :

- Hiremath, L.B. (2005). Economics of production and processing of fruits and vegetables. *Indian J. Agric. Mktg.*, **1**(6):21-26.
- Islam, M.A. (1998). An economic analysis of pineapple production in Madhupur Thana under Tangail district. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh.
- Jose, V.C. (1993). Feasibility of pineapple as an intercrop in small holdings of rubber in Muvattupuzha taluka. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur, KERALA (INDIA).
- Mishra, J.P., Singh, R.I. and Singh, G.N. (1976). Study of farm business analysis in district Basti (U.P). *Rural India*, **40** (2-3): 43.
- OlayinkaIsaika, Baruwa (2013). Profitability and constrains of pineapple production in Osun state, Nigeria. *J. Hort. Res.*, **21** (2) : 59-64.
- Padmini, T.S. (2002). Problem and prospects of pineapple cultivation in Kerala. University of Kerala, Trivandrum, KERALA (INDIA).
- Rymbai, D., Singh, R. and Feroze, S.M. (2012). Benefit costs ratio of pineapple orchard in Meghalaya. *Indian J. Hill Farm.*, **25** (1) : 9-12.
- Thomas, J.M. (2015). Return and efficiency of intercrop pineapple cultivation in Kerala, Ph.D. Thesis, Cochin University of Science and Technology.

8<sup>th</sup>  
Year  
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★