



Research Paper

Resource use efficiency in Bt cotton cultivation across different farm size holders in northern transitional zone of Karnataka

■ P.B. GAMANAGATTI, M.T. DODAMANI AND A.S. MENASINAHAL

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :

P.B. GAMANAGATTI

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

Email : pavanecon@gmail.com

Paper History :

Received : 20.11.2012;

Revised : 05.07.2013;

Accepted : 04.08.2013

ABSTRACT : Karnataka is one of the nine major Bt. cotton-growing states in the country. Northern transitional zone is the major cotton growing zone of Karnataka. It focused on the socio-economic characteristics of Bt cotton farmers and the efficiency of resource use in Bt cotton production under different farm sizes. Two Talukas of having highest cotton area were selected from the zone for study. The present study was conducted, entirely based on a multi stage sampling technique for collecting data from 180 Bt cotton growing farmers. The study pertained to the agricultural year 2010-11. The resource use efficiency, estimated using the Cobb Douglas production function, revealed that the small farmers were under-utilized all the inputs (land, seed, farmyard manure and human labour, bullock labour, PPC, fertilizer), where as medium and large farmers were over utilized the resources bullock labour and PPC. There was an increasing returns to scale in small farmers (1.04) where decreasing returns to scale for medium (0.90) and large farmers (0.94). PPC and bullock labour were not efficiently utilized. Profit could be more improved, by using more seed, fertilizer, FYM and hired labour.

KEY WORDS : Bt cotton, Farm sizes, Labour pattern, Resource use efficiency

HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER : Gamanagatti, P.B., Dodamani, M.T. and Menasinahal, A.S. (2013). Resource use efficiency in Bt cotton cultivation across different farm size holders in Northern Transitional Zone, Karnataka. *Internat. Res. J. agric. Eco. & Stat.*, 4 (2): 131-134.