

## Internation Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics

Volume 4 | Issue 2 | September, 2013 | 157-160





## Performance of cotton in traditional paddy fields of Uttara Kannada district of Karnataka

A.S. MENASINAHAL, L.B. KUNNAL AND P.B. GAMANAGATTI

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to:

## A.S. MENASINAHAL

Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA

Email: econanand@gmail. com

## Paper History:

Received: 20.01.2012; Revised: 19.07.2013; Accepted: 17.08.2013 **ABSTRACT:** The study was undertaken in Uttar Kannada district of Karnataka State. The two major Taluks *viz.*, Mundagod and Haliyal where paddy has been largely replaced by cotton were selected for the study. From each taluka, 30 farmers growing paddy and 30 farmers growing cotton were selected randomly for the study. The growth rates in area, production and productivity of cotton for Uttar kannada district were 7.27 per cent, 17.01 per cent and 6.11 per cent, respectively. Whereas, paddy registered a growth rate of -1.74 per cent in case of area, -2.16 per cent in production and -1.69 per cent in case of productivity. The cost of cultivation of cotton was higher than that of paddy but the gross returns were also higher in cotton cultivation resulting in higher net returns compared to these from paddy. Change in temperature (78.33% of farmers) and change in rainfall patterns (70.00% of farmers) were the major reasons for the farmers to shift over to cotton cultivation from their traditional paddy cultivation. Among the financial factors responsible for this shift in cultivation, the major ones were high income from cotton (76.79% of farmers) and low income from paddy (70% of farmers).

**KEY WORDS:** Cost and returns, Growth rates, Cotton, Paddy

HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER: Menasinahal, A.S., Kunnal, L.B. and Gamanagatti, P.B. (2013). Performance of cotton in traditional paddy fields of Uttara Kannada district of Karnataka. *Internat. Res. J. agric. Eco. & Stat.*, 4 (2): 157-160.