



Economic investigation of BRR1 dhan29 and hybrid rice production in Bangladesh: The case of *Haor* area

MS Rahaman¹, MAR Sarkar^{1*}, L Deb¹, MJ Kabir¹, MR Sarker², MAB Siddique¹

¹Agricultural Economics Division, Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, Gazipur, Bangladesh

²IRRI Research Scholar, International Rice Research Institute, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Accepted 02 Feb 2018

Online release 20 Feb 2018

Keyword

Haor

Productivity & Profitability

Resource use efficiency

Factor and income share

*Corresponding Author

MAR Sarkar

✉ mdrouf_bau@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The *Haor* basin is still under-developed and vulnerable area although one of the major agriculture based economic production zone of Bangladesh. A study was conducted in *Haor* areas namely, Sunamganj and Habiganj district to evaluate the productivity, profitability, resource use efficiency and farmers' perception of growing of BRR1 dhan29 and hybrid rice production. The study revealed that per hectare variable cost of hybrid was about 12% higher than BRR1 dhan29 where yield of BRR1 dhan29 was about 12% lower than hybrid rice. Despite producing low yield, BRR1 dhan29 gave about 8% and 73% higher gross return and gross margin, respectively due to negative net return from hybrid rice. Share of human labor cost was found higher compare to other factors of production for both BRR1 dhan29 and hybrid rice production. Farmers' share in total income was found higher for BRR1 dhan29 (47.74%) than hybrid rice (32.19%). The coefficient of human labor, fertilizer, insecticides and irrigation cost were found positive and statistically significant. Resource use efficiency of BRR1 dhan29 shown that, fertilizer, insecticide and irrigation ratio were greater than one (under utilization) where excessive use of human labor and seed rate. In case of hybrid rice, farmers have ample opportunities to use more fertilizer and irrigation where too much use of human labor, seed rate and insecticides. Study also found that, majority of the farmers' preferred BRR1 dhan29 than hybrid rice in their field as good grain quality and higher market demand. Based on the result, it is recommendation that short duration and high yielding premium quality varieties should be developed and introduced and accordingly proper measures should be taken for enhancing agricultural productivity and ensure adequate living standard in the *Haor* areas.

INTRODUCTION

Bangladesh has a primary agrarian economy. Agriculture plays a key role in economic growth about 14.75 percent of national domestic product in the Fiscal Year 2016-17 (BBS, 2016). Rice is the main cereal crop grown in three different seasons, namely Aus (April to August), Aman (August to December) and Boro (January to June) in Bangladesh and the main source of livelihood for the majority of the people (Banglapedia, 2012). The availability of arable land has been decreasing over the time due to transformation of arable land to other non-agricultural purposes (Halim, et al., 2013). So, there is a great challenge to sustain the food security status and supply of additional food for the ever-growing extra population of the country from shrinking land and other scarce resources. Proper utilization of *Haor* region by enhancing cropping intensity can be an option to increase rice production of the country to face the

future demand for food (Jabber and Alam, 1996). Being a vital source of rice production; *Haor* areas plays a significant role in the economy of Bangladesh.

Haor basin in Bangladesh comprised of large areas of seven districts, namely Sylhet, Sunamganj, Habiganj, Moulvibazar, Kishoreganj, Brahmanbaria and Netrokona districts covering 1.99 million ha areas (MOWR, 2012). There are about 373 *Haor* covered an area of 0.8 million ha which is around 43% of the total area (BHWDB, 2012). The crop production practices, economic activities and overall livelihoods are quite different from other parts of the country (Alam, et al., 2010). Agriculture is the principal livelihood of the farmers and mainly they grow rice in dry season (December-May) as the area remains either stagnant with water or in flash flood condition during wet season (June to November). The area contributes only 6-8% to the national GDP due

mainly to low cropping intensity (MOWR, 2012). Moreover, crops are frequently affected by flash flood in that region. Hence, there is an ample opportunity to increase crop production through dissemination of modern technologies including MV rice and non-rice crops in this region.

Adoption of hybrid rice is now considered as the superior technology over the existing inbred modern rice varieties due to produce 15-20% higher yield at the farmers' field driven by its grain quality and the economic benefit (BRRI, 1999). But the adoption rate of BRRI dhan29 in Habiganj and Sunamganj districts were respectively 10% and 20% higher than that of hybrid rice (DAE, 2015). However, no studies found to be assessed the profitability and relative advantages of hybrid and inbred MVs in the *Haor* areas. This study is imperative in providing information that will be helpful in designing programme in *Haor* region thereby contributes to overall agricultural development and poverty alleviation. Therefore, a study was undertaken to evaluate the productivity, profitability and resource use efficiency as well as to know the perception of growers of BRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice in the *Haor* region.

METHODOLOGY

From each of Sunamganj and Habiganj district, one village was selected purposively for this study. Simple random sampling technique was followed to select the sample farmers. A total of 120 farmers were interviewed, of which 60 was for BRRI dhan29 and another 60 was for hybrid rice growers. In Boro season, *Hira*, *SL8H*, *ACI*, *Jonokraj*, *Tej*, *Agomoni*, etc. were the most popular hybrid rice varieties in the *Haor* areas. A pre-tested structured questionnaire was used for collecting the data. The collected data were the edited carefully before processed through computer software. Both the descriptive and inferential techniques were applied for analyzing the data.

Cob-Douglas production function was used to estimate the effects of various inputs on return. The cost of five major yield contributing factors such as human labor, seed, fertilizers, insecticides and irrigation were considered as independent variables in the model. The cost of power tiller and

rental value of land was not taken into account for the analysis, as there were no variations in those costs among the farmers and rice varieties.

The specification of the model was as follows:

$$Y = aX_1^{b_1} X_2^{b_2} X_3^{b_3} X_4^{b_4} X_5^{b_5} e^u$$

$$\text{or, } \ln Y = \ln a + b_1 \ln X_1 + b_2 \ln X_2 + b_3 \ln X_3 + b_4 \ln X_4 + b_5 \ln X_5 + U$$

Moreover, the efficiency of resource allocation was tested through the ratio of marginal value product (MVP) to the marginal factor cost (MFC) for each input equivalent to unity, i.e., MVP/MFC=1. The marginal productivity of a particular input represents the additional to gross return in value term caused by an additional one unit of that resource, when others hold constant. Dhawan and Bansal (1977) reported that, using geometric mean of explanatory variables (X_i) and gross return (Y) is a more efficient approach to estimate MVP's. Therefore, MVP's was calculated by multiplying the slope co-efficient of each explanatory variable with the ratio of geometric mean (GM) of gross return to the GM of the given resources, i.e.,

$$\ln Y = \ln a + b_i \ln X_i$$

$$\frac{dY}{dx_i} = b_i \frac{Y}{x_i}$$

$$\text{Therefore, MVP } (X_i) = b_i \frac{Y(\text{GM})}{x_i(\text{GM})}$$

Where,

Y = Mean value of GM of gross return in Taka;

X_i = Mean value of GM of the i^{th} variable input in Taka.

On the other hand, MFC is the price of per unit of input. If the MFC's of all the inputs expressed in terms of an additional Taka, in calculating the ratio of MVP to MFC, the denominator will always be one, and therefore, the ratio will be equal to their respective MVP.

If the ratio (MVP/MFC) is greater than one (MVP>1) it would indicate that the farmers are using, on an average, their resource inefficiently. If the ratio (MVP/MFC) is equal to one (MVP=1), it would imply that the farmers are efficient. If the ratio (MVP/MFC) is less than one (MVP<1), it indicates that too much of the particular resource was being used under the prevailing conditions and given the level of utilization of other inputs (Yutopoulos, 1967).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic features

Table 1 represents the socio-demographic features of the respondent farmers. The average family size of the farm households was 5.6 of which 47% male. The average farm size of the sample farmers was 0.79 hectare and most farmers were small farm type around 75%. It was observed that about 11% sample farmers were illiterate and 33% of farmers' level of education was primary. The majority of farmers (65%) belonged to active age group (between 31 to 50 years), and one average nearly half of the respondent farmers was between 21-40 year experiences of farming. Agriculture was the main source of livelihood around 84% of farm household in the *Haor* region.

Table 1
Socio-demographic features of sample households.

| Characteristics | Unit |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Family size (no./household) | 5.6 |
| Male | 2.7 |
| Female | 2.9 |
| Farm size (ha) | 0.79 |
| Farm classification (%): Small | 75 |
| Medium | 22 |
| Large | 3 |
| Age (%): 20-30 years | 15 |
| 31-50 years | 65 |
| 51-above years | 20 |
| Farming experiences (%): 0-10 years | 8 |
| 11-20 years | 28 |
| 21-40 years | 46 |
| Above 50 years | 18 |
| Education (%): Illiterate (0) | 11 |
| Primary (I-V) | 33 |
| High school (VI-IX) | 27 |
| SSC | 20 |
| HSC | 7 |
| Graduate and Above | 2 |
| Occupation (%): Agriculture | 84 |
| Petty business | 10 |
| Fishing | 3 |
| Service | 1 |
| Others | 2 |

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Input use pattern

Per hectare human labor requirement of hybrid rice was slightly higher (118 man-days/ha) than inbred BRRi dhan29 (110 man-days/ha). It indicates that, hybrid rice required more intensive care than BRRi dhan29. Similarly, farmers applied more fertilizer in hybrid rice (336 kg/ha) than BRRi dhan29 (257 kg/ha) but still *Haor* farmers applied lower doses of fertilizers than that of BRRi recommendation, possibly because of better soil fertility. While per hectare seed rate of BRRi dhan29 (35 kg/ha) was 4 times higher than hybrid (9 kg/ha). From Table 2 it was obvious that, hybrid rice required more inputs compared to inbred rice variety BRRi dhan29.

Table 2
Input use pattern of BRRi dhan29 and hybrid rice in the *Haor* areas.

| Input item | BRRi dhan29 | Hybrid |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Human labor (man-day/ha): | | |
| Family | 49 | 52 |
| Hired | 61 | 66 |
| Ploughing no. | 9 | 9 |
| Seed (kg/ha) | 35 | 9 |
| Fertilizer (kg/ha): | | |
| Urea | 157 | 176 |
| TSP | 53 | 77 |
| MP | 47 | 83 |

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Profitability of rice production

Per hectare costs and return of hybrid rice and BRRi dhan29 are presented in Table 3. The present study found that, per hectare production cost for BRRi dhan29 was Tk. 80,493. Where human labor cost was Tk. 40,160 and Tk. 15,878 for land rental charge. On the other hand, total production cost for hybrid rice was Tk. 88,154 whereas human labor and land rental cost were Tk. 42,760 and Tk. 15,878 respectively. That means the total production cost for BRRi dhan29 was about 8.69% lower than the hybrid rice varieties cultivation. Per hectare yield of BRRi dhan29 (5780 kg/ha) was about 12% lower than hybrid (6450 kg/ha). Despite producing lower yield,

BRRRI dhan29 harvested about 8% and 73% higher gross return and gross margin, respectively due to higher paddy price for larger market demand and lower production cost. It was concluded from Table 3 that, hybrid rice production in *Haor* region was marginally profitable farm enterprise.

Factor share of rice production

Factor sharing the output included current inputs, human labor, power tiller and land. Human labor itself earned the highest share of outputs, which were 48.40% and 56.22% of BRRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice, respectively. Current inputs cost earned second highest share of which 22.72% and 31.44% for BRRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice cultivation, respectively. The residual or net profit, which goes to the management or operator, was 3% for BRRRI dhan29 but -15.90% for hybrid rice (Table 4). The negative residuals for hybrid rice indicates that, total cost of production is greater than output value hence farmers did not receive any return by cultivating hybrid rice.

Income share of rice production

Production participants sharing the income included the farmer, hired labor and power tiller cost. By cultivating BRRRI dhan29, the farmer earned 47.74% of the total income of which 24.76% was generated by land, 19.11% by family labor and 3.87% as residuals. Besides, in hybrid rice cultivation, the farmer earned only 32.19% of the total income of which 30.45% was generated by land, 24.93% by family labor and -23.19% as residual, respectively (Table 5). Income share of hired labor (57.07%) and power tiller (10.74%) was higher in hybrid rice production compared to BRRRI dhan29 (43.53% and 8.73%, respectively).

Last but not least, factor and income share analysis revealed that, the human labor contributed the highest effort to the production process of rice; and, on the other hand, farmers earned the highest share of income in BRRRI dhan29 than hybrid rice production.

Table 3

Costs and return of BRRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice in the *Haor* areas.

| Items | BRRRI dhan29 | Hybrid |
|---|--------------|--------|
| A. Variable Cost (Tk./ha) | | |
| Seeds/seedling | 3475 | 4165 |
| Labor cost | 40,160 | 42,760 |
| Land preparation cost | 5600 | 5600 |
| Fertilizer | 4425 | 5637 |
| Irrigation | 8027 | 9262 |
| Herbicide | 352 | 352 |
| Insecticide | 1257 | 3021 |
| Total Variable Cost | 63,296 | 70,797 |
| B. Fixed Cost (Tk./ha) | | |
| Interest on operating capital @10 for five months | 1319 | 1479 |
| Land rent (Tk./ha) | 15878 | 15878 |
| Total Fixed Cost | 17,197 | 17,357 |
| C. Total cost (Tk./ha) (A+B) | | |
| Yield (kg/ha) | 5780 | 6450 |
| D. Gross return (Tk./ha) | | |
| Gross return (Tk./ha) | 82,975 | 76,063 |
| Gross margin (Tk./ha) | 19,680 | 5266 |
| Net return (Tk./ha) | 2483 | -12092 |
| E. BCR on cash cost basis | | |
| | 1.31 | 1.07 |
| F. BCR on full cost basis | | |
| | 1.03 | 0.86 |

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 4
Comparative factor share of BRRi dhan29 and hybrid rice cultivation.

| Items | BRRi dhan29 | | Hybrid | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | Value (Tk./ha) | Factor share (%) | Value (Tk./ha) | Factor share (%) |
| Total value of output: | 82,975 | 100.00 | 76,063 | 100.00 |
| Current inputs cost: | 18,855 | 22.72 | 23,916 | 31.44 |
| a) Fertilizer | 4425 | 5.33 | 5637 | 7.41 |
| b) Irrigation | 8027 | 9.68 | 9262 | 12.18 |
| c) Seed/seedling | 3475 | 4.18 | 4165 | 5.48 |
| d) Insecticide and herbicide | 1609 | 1.94 | 3373 | 4.43 |
| e) Interest on operating capital | 1319 | 1.59 | 1479 | 1.94 |
| Total human labor | 40,160 | 48.40 | 42,760 | 56.22 |
| Power tiller | 5600 | 6.75 | 5600 | 7.37 |
| Land rent cost | 15,878 | 19.14 | 15,878 | 20.87 |
| Residual | 2483 | 3.00 | -12092 | -15.90 |

Note: Current inputs (fertilizer, irrigation, seed/seedling cost, insecticide and herbicide, interest on operating capital)
Residual = Total value of output – (paid to current inputs cost + human labor cost + power tiller cost + land rent cost)

Table 5
Comparative income share of BRRi dhan29 and hybrid rice cultivation.

| Items | BRRi dhan29 | | Hybrid | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | Value (Tk./ha) | Income share (%) | Value (Tk./ha) | Income share (%) |
| Value added | 64120 | 100 | 52147 | 100 |
| Hired labor + contact labor | 27910 | 43.53 | 29760 | 57.07 |
| Power tiller cost | 5600 | 8.73 | 5600 | 10.74 |
| Farmer: | 30611 | 47.74 | 16786 | 32.19 |
| a) Land | 15878 | 24.76 | 15878 | 30.45 |
| b) Family labor | 12250 | 19.11 | 13000 | 24.93 |
| c) Residual | 2483 | 3.87 | -12092 | -23.19 |

Note: Residual = Total value of product – (Amount (Tk.) paid to current inputs, human labor, power tiller and land rent); Value added = Total value of output – Cost of current inputs (Fertilizer, Irrigation, Seed/seedling cost, Insecticide and herbicide, Interest on operating capital); Farmer = Value added – (Hired labor cost + Contact labor cost + Power tiller cost)

Factors affecting on return

Many factors might affect production of farm household but it is quite difficult to include all variables in a model for analysis because of the multicollinearity or other logical aspects. So, important variables were included to keep the model as simple as possible (Sarker et al., 2011).

We considered five factors namely, human labor, seedling, fertilizer, insecticide and irrigation in this study. Table 6 represents, the estimated coefficient of the production variables of BRRi dhan29 and hybrid rice using Cobb-Douglas production function model. The effect of the production variables on return are explained by the coefficient of these variables. The regression coefficient of

human labor cost, fertilizer cost and irrigation cost of BRRRI dhan29 was 0.354, 0.151 and 0.146, respectively, which were positive and significant. It indicates that, holding all other factors constant, one percent increase of human labor cost, fertilizer cost and irrigation cost of BRRRI dhan29 would increase return by 0.354, 0.151 and 0.146 percent, respectively. On the other hand, the coefficient of seedling and insecticide cost of BRRRI dhan29 was positive but insignificant, which means that, this variables has no impact on increasing return. The fitted Cobb-Douglas production function for BRRRI dhan29 was found to be valid as indicated by F-value and R-square. The co-efficient of multiple determination (R^2) was 0.79 indicates that, about 79 percent of return in rice production was explained by the explanatory variables included in the model.

For regression coefficient of human labor, fertilizer, insecticide and irrigation cost of hybrid rice production was 0.278, 0.147, 0.024 and 0.181, respectively, which were positive and significant. It implies one percent increase in cost like human labor, fertilizer, insecticides and irrigation then the return of hybrid rice cultivation significantly increased by 0.278, 0.147, 0.024 and 0.181 percent, respectively. The F-values (15.30) of the equation derived for hybrid rice production was highly significant at 1% level and all the

explanatory variables were important for explaining the variations on return of the operators. The co-efficient of multiple determinations, R^2 was 0.81 that indicates, the explanatory variables included in the model explained 81% of total variation in hybrid rice production.

Elasticity of production

Returns to scale for BRRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice were 0.71 and 0.64, respectively. In this study, the elasticity for BRRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice producing farmers were less than one, which clearly pointed out that, the growers allotted their resources in the rational stage of production (Stage-II) where diminishing returns to scale existed (Table 6).

Efficiency of resource use in rice production

Resource use efficiency means how efficiently the farmer can use his/her resources in the production process. It is important to ensure efficient use of resources, because resources are always limited (Majumder et al., 2009). For measuring resource use efficiency, five factors were considered namely, human labor, seedling, fertilizer, insecticide and irrigation in this study (Table 7).

Table 6
Estimated co-efficient of rice production using Cobb-Douglas production function.

| Variables | BRRRI dhan29 | Hybrid |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Intercept | 8.713* | 7.633* |
| Human labor cost (X_1) | 0.354* (0.179) | 0.278* (0.140) |
| Seedling cost (X_2) | 0.036 (0.033) | 0.013 (0.011) |
| Fertilizer cost (X_3) | 0.151* (0.079) | 0.147** (0.060) |
| Insecticides cost (X_4) | 0.020 (0.028) | 0.024* (0.012) |
| Irrigation cost (X_5) | 0.146*** (0.051) | 0.181*** (0.065) |
| F- value | 12.80*** | 15.30*** |
| R^2 | 0.79 | 0.81 |
| Returns to scale | 0.707 | 0.643 |

*** Significant at 1% level, ** Significant at 5% level and *Significant at 10% level

Note: Figures in the parentheses indicate standard error. (Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.)

Table 7
Efficiency of inputs in production function.

| Inputs | Geometric mean | Co-efficient | Efficiency |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| BRRI dhan29 | | | |
| Gross Return (Y) | 82720.77 | | |
| Human labor (X ₁) | 40151.88 | 0.354 | 0.729 |
| Seedling (X ₂) | 3438.52 | 0.036 | 0.869 |
| Fertilizer (X ₃) | 4393.95 | 0.151 | 2.836 |
| Insecticides (X ₄) | 1186.66 | 0.020 | 1.389 |
| Irrigation (X ₅) | 7999.82 | 0.146 | 1.507 |
| Hybrid | | | |
| Gross Return (Y) | 76052.17 | | |
| Human labor (X ₁) | 42703.92 | 0.278 | 0.495 |
| Seedling (X ₂) | 4124.05 | 0.013 | 0.230 |
| Fertilizer (X ₃) | 5516.86 | 0.147 | 2.030 |
| Insecticides (X ₄) | 3001.39 | 0.024 | 0.605 |
| Irrigation (X ₅) | 9191.88 | 0.181 | 1.495 |

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

Table 8
Positive and negative traits of BRRI dhan29 and hybrid rice production.

| BRRI dhan29 | | Hybrid rice | |
|--|----|---|----|
| Positive Traits | %* | Positive Traits | %* |
| Lower production cost | 90 | Higher yield | 99 |
| Good grain quality | 87 | 10-15 days earlier than BRRI dhan29 | 95 |
| Farmers can germinate seed for next planting | 80 | Required lower amount of seed rate | 82 |
| Good eating quality | 78 | Negative Traits | |
| Lower intensity to attack pest and diseases | 72 | Lower market demand due to inferior grain quality | 97 |
| Negative Traits | | Stickiness of cooked rice | 94 |
| Long duration | 99 | High intensity to attack pest and diseases | 91 |
| Unavailability of trusted seed dealers | 92 | Unfavorable odor | 86 |
| Drowned by early flash flood | 87 | Higher price of seed | 84 |
| | | Need to take intensive care | 79 |

* Percent of respondents.

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16.

The ratio of MVP and MFC for fertilizer (2.836), insecticide (1.389) and irrigation (1.507) were greater than one and positive in BRRI dhan29 production. It reveals that, the farmers have not availed themselves of the opportunities to the fuller use of various inputs. So, there were ample opportunities for farmers of the study areas to increase output per hectare by using more of these inputs. That is, more profit could be obtained by increasing investment in those inputs. On the other hand, efficiency ratio for BRRI dhan29 was

positive and less than one for use of human labor (0.729) and seedling cost (0.869). It indicates that, there was no scope for spending more for use of labor and seedling cost which would decrease profit. In case of hybrid rice production, the ratio of MVP and MFC for human labor (0.495), seedling cost (0.230) and insecticides cost (0.605) were positive but less than one. That means, the farmers should limit the use of these inputs. Whereas efficiency ratio of hybrid rice for fertilizer (2.030) and irrigation (1.495) cost were

greater than one and positive indicates that, there was still scope to increase profit by using of these inputs more.

Farmer's perception on BRR1 dhan29 and hybrid rice production in Haor areas

The farm level positive and negative traits on their preferences as observed and opined by the sample farmers were summarized in Table 8. The positive traits for cultivating BRR1 dhan29 were lower production cost, good grain quality, lower seed price, farmers can germinate seed for next planting, good eating quality and lower intensity to attack pest and diseases than hybrid. But long growth duration, unavailability of trusted seed dealers and drowned by early flash flood were the main drawbacks for cultivation BRR1 dhan29 on Haor areas. Similarly, higher yield, 10-15 days early and required lower amount of seed rate were the advantages for adopting hybrid rice. But inferior grain quality, stickiness, high intensity to attack pest and diseases, unfavorable odor, higher price of seed and more intensive care were mentioned negative traits by the respondent farmers for less adoption of hybrid rice.

CONCLUSION

Haor region remains a part of Bangladesh where natural shocks and seasonal food insecurity creating conditions of extreme and widespread vulnerability for a significant proportion of the population. The study was undertaken to evaluate the overall impact of BRR1 dhan29 and hybrid rice in the Haor region. The socio-demographic feature of the sample farmers was consistent but the cropping system was very different from other part of the country. In Haor areas, farmers preferred BRR1 dhan29 than hybrid variety though there is no significant variation of total cost of production. But on the basis of income share, farmers get higher net return for cultivating BRR1 dhan29 and negative net return for hybrid rice production. The resource use efficiency analysis indicated that, none of the inputs were equal to one. This inequality means, the farmers in the study areas have failed to show their efficiency in using the resources. So, the farmers have opportunities to increase margin by efficient use of available inputs. To end with, efforts should be given more

for the extended diffusion of BRR1 dhan29 along with the associated management practices in the Haor region that would eventually increase the level of agricultural productivity in Bangladesh.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of the present research, the following recommendations are made to boost up rice productivity in Haor areas that lead to improve farmer's livelihood of this region.

- Short duration (130-135 days) and high yielding inbred Boro rice varieties should be developed;
- Premium quality hybrid rice varieties should be introduced;
- Government should have strengthening the supply of farm machineries and ensure their usages timely;
- Equitable climate information services should be addressed that enable small holder farmers to provide information tailored to farmer's decision;
- Sustainable flood control measures like embankment, river dredging etc. should be taken as early as possible;
- Extension service should be strengthened to buildup awareness about the use of crop calendar;
- Ensure the availability of seeds, fertilizer, diesel and electricity at the beginning of the Boro season as well as irrigation facilities should be developed; and,
- The communication and marketing facilities have to be improved in Haor areas.

REFERENCE

- Alam MS, Quayum MA and Islam MA (2010). Crop Production in the Haor Areas of Bangladesh: Insights from Farm Level Survey, The Agriculturists, 8 (2): 88-97.
- Banglapedia (2012). Season in Bangladesh. National Encyclopedia of Bangladesh. <http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Season> (accessed on Jan 29, 2018).
- BBS (2016). Statistical Yearbook of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Planning Division, Ministry of Planning, Government of

- the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- BHWDB (2012). Bangladesh *Haor* and Wetland Development Board. Ministry of Water Resources, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- BRRI (1999). BRRI Annual Report. Agricultural Economics Division, Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, Gazipur, Bangladesh.
- DAE (2015). District-wise Area Coverage Data. Department of Agricultural Extension, Ministry of Agriculture, Khamarbari, Farmgate, Dhaka.
- Dhawan KC and Bansal PK (1977). Rationality of the Use of Various Factors of Production on Different Sizes of Farm in the Punjab. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 32(3): 121-130.
- Halim MA Rahman MM and Hassan MZ (2013). Agricultural Land Conversion in the Sub-urban Area: A Case Study of Rajshahi Metropolitan City. Journal of Life Earth Science, 8: 21-30.
- Jabber MA and Alam MS (1996). Adoption of Modern Rice Varieties in Bangladesh. Journal of Agricultural Economics. 16 (2): 77-95.
- Majumder KM, Mozumder L and Roy PC (2009). Productivity and Resource Use Efficiency of Boro Rice Productin. Journal of Bangladesh Agricultural University. 7(2): 247-252.
- MOWR (2012). Master Plan of *Haor* Area. Volume 1, Summary Report, April 2012, Ministry of Water Resources, Government of Peoples' Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Sarker MR and Islam MS (2011). An Economic Study of Small-scale *Koi (Anabas Testudineus)* Fish Farming in Some Selected Areas of Greater Mymensingh District. Bangladesh Journal of Political Economy, 27 (1 & 2): 287-97.
- Yotopoulos PA (1967). Allocative Efficiency in Economic Development, Research Monograph Series, No. 18 (191-192), Constantinidis and C. Mihalas, Athens.