

income, family labour income and net income were `53940.31, `46045.31 and `43396.50, respectively. On an overall basis, returns on cost  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  basis were `53940.31, `53940.31, `52045.31, `46045.31, `49396.50, `43396.50 and `40215.15, respectively. On an average, the returns per rupee of investment on cost  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  were `3.56, `3.56, `3.28, `2.59, `2.93, `2.37 and `2.15, respectively. The marketable surplus had a tendency to increase with increase in farm size. Due to immediate cash needs, there was no difference in marketed and marketable surplus. The market analysis of basmati revealed that Channel-II was more remunerative because farmer's share in consumer rupee was high (66.09 per cent). The net share of commission agent was higher in Channel-II (1.37 per cent). The net share of wholesaler was 1.72 per cent in consumer rupee. The net share of miller was 10.66 per cent. The net share of retailer was 2.38 per cent. The price spread was highest in Channel-I (35.73 per cent) followed by Channel II (33.91 per cent). The market analysis of PR-106 revealed that Channel-I was more remunerative because farmer's share in consumer rupee was high (59.48 per cent). The net share of commission agent was 1.24 per cent. The net share of wholesaler was 1.61 per cent share in consumer rupee. The net share of miller was 11.67 per cent. The net share of retailer was 2.37 per cent. Price spread was more in Channel-II (41.53 per cent) followed by Channel-I (40.52 per cent). The major constraints in production of paddy were shortage of hired human labour for transplanting and harvesting, erratic electricity supply, poor quality of insecticide and pesticides. The major constraints in marketing of paddy were high price fluctuations, high cost of labour, malpractices in the mandi, lack of storage facilities at farm levels and high cost of transportation.

**Beauty Debbarma (2011) *Comparative Economics of System of Rice Intensification (SRI) in Tripura State of North-East India***, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Post Graduate Studies, Central Agricultural University.

**Subject: Agricultural Economics**  
**Major Advisor: Dr. Ram Singh**  
JEL Classification: Y40

Rice is the important crop of India and it occupies 23.3 per cent of gross cropped area of the country. Area under rice in Tripura is 237 thousand ha with production and productivity 624.66 thousand metric ton and 2.51 tonnes per ha, respectively. Among the rice producing technology, SRI is modern method of rice production. Area under SRI in Tripura State is increasing year by year. The state is facing a deficit of 3.1 lakh tonnes of paddy. The specific objectives of the study were (i) to work out the comparative economics of rice under SRI and Non-SRI methods, (ii) to analyze input-output relationship of both the technologies and (iii) to examine the constraints in rice cultivation and suggest measures to overcome the same were under taken in the study. The study was conducted in two districts namely Dhalai and West of Tripura State of NEH region. One block from each district viz; Salema and Bishalgarh from Dhalai and West on the basis of area were selected, respectively. Two villages from each block were selected on the basis of highest area. From each village, 30 rice growers, comprising of 15 SRI and 15 Non-SRI farmers were selected to make the sample size of 120 respondent in both the districts. Both primary and secondary data were used in the study. The cost concept, linear regression and Garrett's ranking technique was used to analyze the primary household data. The results revealed that the average yield of SRI farmers of Dhalai and West district was comparatively higher than Non-SRI farms in both the districts. The net income of SRI farmers was found 25 per cent higher than Non-SRI Farmers of Dhalai district, whereas, the net income of SRI farmers was found 48 per cent higher than Non-SRI

Farmers. Cost  $A_1$  for SRI was ₹16888.94 and ₹16884.42 in Dhalai and West districts, respectively. On the other hand the Cost  $A_1$  for Non-SRI Farm was ₹19591.80 and ₹18363.82 in Dhalai and West district, respectively. Cost  $B_2$  found more on small category under SRI in both districts, whereas it was found more on marginal farm under Non-SRI compared to small category farm in Dhalai district and vice-versa in West district. It may be due to high rental value of land of small and marginal category of farms under SRI and Non-SRI method. Cost  $C_2$  -for SRI and Non-SRI Farms accounted ₹35564.68 and ₹49766.80 in Dhalai, whereas, Cost  $C_2$  -for SRI and Non-SRI Farms accounted ₹82994.78 and ₹98516.46 in West district. It showed that SRI farmers of small category imputed more family labor than marginal category under both the districts. Under Non-SRI Method, imputed family labor was more on marginal farm compared to small farm in Dhalai district which was vice-versa in West district. The linear regression equation indicated that the variable fertilizer and plant protection measures were significant in SRI farm, whereas, the fertilizers and seeds were found to be negatively significant on the Non-SRI Farm. Among the various problems faced by the farmers during rice production, non availability and high price of labor, lower yield due to drought, non availability and high prices of fertilizer, lack of irrigation facilities, non availability of HYV-seeds, non availability of extension services, less yield due to flood and non availability of farm implements were found severe. Hence, SRI being a resource conserving technology, its benefits must be realized through extension workers. Agri-inputs should be availed through public-private-partnership (PPP) to encourage the SRI model in the state.

**Gurpreet Kaur(2012) *Role of Trade Credit at Farm Level Chain Coordination - A study of Wheat Growers in Ludhiana district of Punjab***, Department of Economics and Sociology, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana-141004, P. 59

**Subject: Agricultural Economics**  
**Major Advisor: Dr. Veena Goel**  
**JEL Classification: Y40**

The study was undertaken with the aim to (i) find out farmers' assets position, cropping patterns and the inputs purchase as well as wheat disposal patterns; (ii) farmers' credit requirements from the chain partners; (iii) nature and duration of farmers' relationships with their upstream and downstream chain partners and its economic benefits for their business enterprises, and (iv) future scenario for non-institutional credit and its policy implications. To meet these objectives data for the crop year 2009-10 were collected from farmers of two blocks namely Khanna and Sidhwan Bet from Ludhiana district that were selected on the basis of shares of market arrivals from the district level. From the command areas of the wholesale markets of each block depending upon their distance three village had been selected and from these villages a sample of 94 farmers that categorized into small, medium and large sized had been obtained. The results revealed that all the sample sized farmers' total cultivated area was 505.50 hectares, of this 58.45 per cent was owned while 41.55 per cent was leased in, 40-50 per cent farmers owned different types of farm machinery and equipment, 90.63 per cent of the cultivated area was under wheat, 89.36 per cent farmers purchased various operational inputs from the open market agents, 92.55 per cent of the sample respondents sold wheat during the post harvest period through their preferred commission agents while 40.42 per cent of them also sold wheat during the off-season through *chakki* owners or village grocers. 46.81 per cent sample farmers raised credit, of which 43.62 per cent from Primary