

Economics of direct seeding methods of upland rice production in the Northern Guinea Savanna

Nwokwu Gilbert Nwogboduhu

Department of Crop Production and Landscape Management, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.

Received:

July 10, 2017

Accepted:

October 19, 2017

Published:

December 17, 2017

*Corresponding author email:
g.nwokwu@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study assessed the economic impacts of direct seeding of rice as an alternative crop establishment method for farmers in Samaru, Zaria in the Northern Guinea Savanna of Nigeria. Specifically, it examined the changes in farmers' inputs (labour and inputs) and level of productivity and incomes among direct-seeded methods such as broadcasting, drilling and dibbling and measured the economic returns on investment in direct seeding. Analyses included cost and return, and economic surplus framework. The economic analysis of upland rice production at both locations indicated that production of NERICA 8 and JAMILA by either broadcasting or drilling method at the seed rate of 80 kg ha⁻¹ gave the highest gross margin as well as return on investment. The result revealed that NERICA 8 and JAMILA sown by broadcasting method at 80 kg ha⁻¹ was the most profitable with gross margin of ₦246, 166.50 with return on investment of ₦6.72. This was followed by broadcasting JAMILA at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate which gave a gross margin of ₦194, 583.50 and return on investment of ₦4.32. However, the least gross margin of ₦61, 249.85 was observed when NERICA 4 was dibbled at 120 kg ha⁻¹ which brought a loss of ₦16, 716.50 and ₦0.62k was lost per every naira invested.

Keywords: Economics, Direct Seeding, Upland Rice, Production

Introduction

Rice is the world's most important crop and is a staple food for more than half of the world's population. Worldwide, rice is grown on 161 million hectares, with an annual production of about 678.7 million tons of paddy (FAO, 2009). About 90% of the world's rice is grown and produced (143 million ha of area with a production of 612 million tons of paddy) in Asia (FAO, 2009). Rice provides 30–75% of the total calories to more than 3 billion people (Khush, 1997; Von Braun and Bos, 2004). To meet the global rice demand, it is estimated that about 114 million tons of additional milled rice need to be produced by 2035, which is equivalent to an overall increase of 26% in the next 25 years (Yamano et al., 2016). The

possibility of expanding the area under rice in the near future is limited. Therefore, this extra rice production needed has to come from a productivity gain. The major challenge to achieve this gain is less water, labour and chemicals (Hira, 2009)

A major reason for farmers' interest in direct seeding is the rising cost of cultivation and decreasing profits with conventional practice. Farmers likely prefer a technology that gives higher profit despite similar or slightly lower yield. Studies shows that various methods of direct seeding reduced the cost of production by US\$9125 ha⁻¹ compared with conventional practice of transplanting (Inayat-Ali et al., 2012; Santhi et al., 1998). The largest reductions in cost occurred in practices in which zero tillage was combined with direct seeding. These cost reductions



were largely due to either reduced labour cost or tillage cost or both under direct seeding method. In areas where wages are high the labour cost savings in rice establishment can reach US\$50 ha⁻¹ (Kumar et al., 2009).

The conventional method of rice growing is not only water-guzzling but also cumbersome and laborious. Rice transplanting requires 200-250 man-hour ha⁻¹, which is 25% of the total requirement for the rice crop production (Anoop et al., 2007). The problem has further been intensified with the timely unavailability of labour. Delay in transplanting beyond optimum time due to labour scarcity is creating a reduction in rice yield. Further, reduced labour availability is increasing the cost of transplanting and squeezing the farmer's profit as the cost of transplanting is increasing continuously. Paddy transplanting by labour also results in low and non-uniform plant population due to which crop yields are reduced (Mahajan et al., 2009). The productivity and sustainability of rice-based systems are threatened because of the inefficient use of inputs; increasing scarcity of resources, especially water and labour; changing climate; the emerging energy crisis and rising fuel prices; the rising cost of cultivation and emerging socio-economic changes such as urbanization, migration of labour, preferences of non-agricultural work, concerns about farm-related pollution (Kumar and Ladha, 2011). Conventional tillage and crop establishment by transplanting is the most input intensive process in crop production and, therefore, more efficient alternatives are urgently needed. Potential solutions is a shift from manual transplanting to direct seeded rice. Direct seeded rice with zero tillage system performed as well as the conventional practice but with significant savings in water and labour use (Bhusan et al., 2007). Direct-seeding is cost-effective, can save water through earlier rice crop establishment (Ladha et al., 2003a; Singh et al., 2003). With alternate wetting and drying cycles in direct seeding, the crop is subjected to greater weed competition than transplanted rice because weeds emerge before or at the same time as the rice (Chuhan, 2012). Therefore, heavy weed infestation is a major problem in direct seeded rice and its success lies in effective weed control measures (Singh et al., 2003; Rao et al., 2007), as failure to eliminate weeds may result in low or no yield (Estorninos and Moody, 1988). Therefore, the study aimed at evaluating the economics of direct seeding methods of upland rice varieties with a goal for finding most suitable ones

with a potential to cover large area with similar agro ecological conditions.

Materials and Methods

The field trials were conducted on the experimental farm of the Institute for Agricultural Research, Ahmadu Bello University Samaru, Zaria and on the Research Farm of the Kaduna State Agricultural Development Programme, Maigana in 2011 and 2012 cropping seasons. Samaru is on the Latitude 11°11' N and Longitude 7°38' E and is 686 m above sea level while Maigana is located on Latitude 11°11.06' N and Longitude 7.54° 7.58' E both in the Northern Guinea Savannah Agro ecological zone of Nigeria. Random samples of soils were taken at depth of 0-30cm from the experimental sites using an auger of 10 cm diameter before land preparation and were analysed for physical and chemical properties.

The treatments consisted of three seeding methods (broadcasting, drilling and dibbling), three seed rates (40, 80 and 120 kg ha⁻¹) and three upland rice varieties (NERICA 4, 8 and JAMILA). The treatments were laid out in a split plot design with the combination of sowing methods and seed rates in the main plots and three rice varieties in the sub plots measuring 3 m x 3 m with a net plot of 2 m x 2 m and were replicated three times. The main plots were separated by a distance of 1 m and the sub plots by 0.5 m. Pre-planting herbicides, glyphosate (round up) was applied to the experimental sites at the rate 2 kg active ingredients ha⁻¹ two weeks before land preparation in each year of the study in order to control the prevalent weeds on the field. Thereafter, the field was harrowed twice to ensure fine tilth of the soil and the soil levelled manually.

Seeds of each variety were treated with Apron star as seed dressing chemical at the rate of 1.0 g of metalaxy to 3.0 kg seed to prevent pest attack and the three rice varieties were planted on 13th July 2011 and 9th June 2012 at Samaru while at Maigana, the varieties were planted on 30th July 2011 and 12th June 2012 when the rains were fully stabilized using direct seeding such as broadcasting, drilling and dibbling methods. Also hand pulling methods of weed control was used to control the weeds that later emerged at four and eight weeks after sowing. Fertilizers were applied at the recommended rate of 100 kg N ha⁻¹, 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and 50 kg K₂O ha⁻¹. The nitrogen fertilizer were applied as split, half of the nitrogen fertilizer together with 50 kg P₂O₅ and 50 kg K₂O ha⁻¹ were applied once



at two weeks after sowing using NPK (15:15:15) while the second half of the nitrogen were applied at panicle initiation stage using urea (46% N). Economics and energy analysis was done by taking pooled data of both the years. The economic analysis was measured using the partial budget procedure to determine the economic return. The data obtained was subjected to economic analysis where the returns and variable costs were calculated and gross margin (GM) and return on investment (ROI) was also determined. This depended on the prevailing market prices of inputs, labour and outputs. This was computed as:

$$GM=TR-TVC \text{ (Olukosi and Erhabor, 1988).}$$

Where;

TR= Total revenue per hectare.

TVC=Total variable cost (sum of labour and material input cost) per hectare.

$$ROI = \text{Net return} / \text{TVC} \times 100/1$$

Where; Net return = Total revenue (yield x output price) – TVC

Results and Discussion

The physical and chemical properties of the soil used during the experimental periods at Samaru and Maigana are summarized in Table 1. In 2011 at Samaru, the physico-chemical properties of the field on which the experiment was conducted showed that the soil was clay loam, slightly acidic with moderate total nitrogen and available phosphorus and low potassium and CEC and high organic carbon. In 2012 cropping season the soil was silt loam, slightly acidic with high total nitrogen; available phosphorus and potassium were moderate while organic carbon and CEC were low. At Maigana in 2011, the soil was silt clay loam, slightly acidic with high total nitrogen and organic carbon while available phosphorus, potassium and CEC were low. In 2012, the soil was sandy loam, slightly acidic with high total nitrogen while available P, K was moderate and organic carbon was high. The cost and return analysis per hectare on investment of growing upland rice varieties using different sowing methods and seed rates in 2011, 2012 wet seasons and the combined at Samaru and Maigana are presented in Tables 3 to 8. At Samaru in 2011, the result revealed that NERICA 8 sown by broadcasting method at 80 kg ha⁻¹ was the most profitable with gross margin

of ₦129, 793.25 and Return on Investment of ₦3.02 which implied that for every ₦1.00 invested ₦2.02 was realized. Similarly, it was followed by NERICA 8 sown by broadcasting method at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate which gave a gross margin of ₦95, 787.65 and Return on Investment of ₦2.23 which implied that for every ₦1.00 invested ₦1.23 was realized. However, the sowing of JAMILA with dibbling method at 120 kg ha⁻¹ brought a loss of ₦17, 932.50 and ₦0.34k was lost per naira invested.

In 2012, the use of broadcasting method to sow JAMILA at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate was the most profitable with gross margin of ₦198, 750.00 and return on investment of ₦4.42 indicating that for ₦1.00 invested ₦3.42 was realized. This was followed by broadcasting JAMILA at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate which gave a gross margin of ₦194, 583.50 and return on investment of ₦4.32. There was no loss incurred during this year's production. However, the least gross margin of ₦61, 249.85 and return on investment of ₦1.11 was observed when NERICA 4 was dibbled at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate.

The combined economic analysis indicated that broadcasting NERICA 8 at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate was the most profitable with gross margin of ₦146, 215.00 and return on investment of ₦4.32 which indicated that for every ₦1.00 invested, ₦3.32 was realized. This was closely followed by either drilled NERICA 8 or JAMILA at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate which gave a gross margin of ₦141, 194.30 and return on investment of ₦3.88. The least gross margin of ₦35, 467.65 and return on investment of ₦1.66 was observed when NERICA 4 was dibbled at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate. Net returns in broadcasting was at par with drilling method and were higher than dibbling method. Kumar (2011) also observed similar findings and found higher B:C ratio in direct seeding as compared to manual puddled transplanted rice.

At Maigana in 2011, the result indicated that the highest gross margin of ₦119, 581.50 and return on investment of ₦3.85 was achieved by broadcasting NERICA 8 at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate. This was followed by drilled NERICA 8 at 80 kg ha⁻¹ which gave a gross margin of ₦30, 832.50 and return on investment of ₦1.73. However, dibbled JAMILA at 120 kg ha⁻¹ brought a loss of ₦16, 716.50 and 0.62k was lost per every naira invested.

In 2012 and the combined, the result indicated that the highest gross margin was by drilled JAMILA at 80 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate. The gross margin of 2012 and the combined were ₦246, 166.50 with return on



investment of ₦6.72 and ₦182,874.00 with return on investment of ₦5.30 respectively. This was followed by drilled JAMILA at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate with gross margin of ₦198,666.50 and return on investment of ₦5.62, gross margin of ₦98,547.50 and return on investment of ₦3.32 for 2012 and the combined data. However, the least gross margin was observed when NERICA 8 was dibbled at 40 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate in 2012 and the combined were ₦24,375.15 with return on investment of ₦1.54 and ₦11,187.50 with return on investment of ₦1.25. In paddy, a labour saving of 95-99 percent in broadcasting or drilling methods were observed as compared to dibbling method during both years of the study and total labour use mainly depends on the weed management. In present study we made two hand weeding to cope up with weeds as the herbicide used were not so effective, which ultimately resulted in more labour use and higher cost of production. In overall, broadcasting and drilling methods had more percent labour saving as compared to dibbling method in both years of the study. Sehrawat et al. (2010) also observed 13-16% labour saving in direct seeding as compared to manual puddled transplanted rice.

Economic analysis is the ultimate yard stick to recommend a production technology. The loss incurred at both locations in 2011 was due to low rainfall recorded in that year.

Generally, throughout the study, increase in total revenue resulted an increase in gross margin in all the three sowing methods used in the study. In 2011 at Samaru, the maximum gross margin obtained from broadcasting method was due to the fact that crops established with these methods matured early than drilling and dibbling method. This helped the crops to escape the stress as a result of late planting as well early cessation of rainfall in that year and thereby resulted in highest yield. Despite the higher cost of production in 2012 wet season and the combined at Samaru, the highest gross margin obtained from broadcasting and drilling method were due to higher grain yield as a result of better rain fall recorded in that year at the experimental sites. Generally, dibbling method consistently produced the least gross margin throughout the study at both locations. This was due to the low yield recorded when rice was sown using this method throughout the study period. In 2011 at both locations, the lowest gross margin was recorded as well as the loss incurred was due to low yield as a result of late planting. However, the highest gross margin in that year was obtained from the

broadcasting method at 80 kg of NERICA 8. The differences in gross margin in the two years at both locations could be attributed to the differences in cost of production as well as the market price. In this country it was discovered that prices of materials at different locations increase as the years passed by without necessarily increase the price of the farm produce. In this study, the cost of production at Maigana was far cheaper than Samaru especially the cost of labour and as well as some inputs such as fertilizers.

In both locations, the cost of labour such as weed control in broadcasting and drilling methods were lower than that of dibbling method. The highest difference in labour cost was in crop establishment. This reduced need for labour not only saves time and money of farmers but also allows greater flexibility so that farmers can attend other activities either in farm or at home. Higher expenditures on seeds were expected in direct seeding methods because higher seeding rates are required for direct seeding relative to transplanting. Farmers who practiced direct seeding were more reliant on herbicides simply because they cannot rely on flooding to suppress weeds during the crucial initial period of crop establishment (Johnson 2006). On the other hand, expenditures on fertilizers, and rent in land preparation were lower for direct seeding than transplanting. This was because farmers were inclined to use more fertilizers as a treatment or preventive measure against transplanting shock.

Previous studies had found that direct seeding may obtain a lower yield due to the unstable establishment of rice seedlings and slow growth during the early growing stage (Kimio et al., 1999). Yield in direct seeding can be also reduced by weed problems. Yield losses (due to weeds) largely depend on season, weed species, weed density, rice cultivar, and growth rate and density of weeds and rice (Azmi et al., 2005). Another factor affecting yield in direct seeding is seed rate. A seed rate higher than the recommended rate can result in lower yield of direct seeding since it may lead to nitrogen deficiency, thus reducing tillering and increasing the proportion of ineffective tillers, to attacks of brown plant hoppers, and to crop lodging. However, yield of direct seeding is not always lower than that of transplanting. Rice yields of wet- or dry-seeded crops have been higher than those of transplanted crops, provided weeds are adequately controlled (Johnson et al., 2003). Higher rice yield resulting from direct seeding is due to the shorter time it takes for direct seeding rice to reach maturity. This



allows for on-time planting, thus saving farmers from a 1 percent (or more) reduction in yield per day (Hobbs 2001).

Rainfall at Samaru during the experimental period was 945.2 and 1333.3mm in 2011 and 2012 respectively (Table 2). Rain started in 2011 on 16th April and ended on 11th October with a total of 73 rainy days. In 2012, rain commenced on 10th April and terminated on 24th October with a total of 76 rainy days. Rainfall at Maigana during the experimental period was 636.6

and 762.9 in 2011 and 2012 respectively. Rain started in 2011 on 25th April and ended on 12th October with a total of 67 rainy days. In 2012, rain commenced on 17th April and ended on 22nd October with a total of 70 rainy days. Generally, rainfall was not evenly distributed during the conduct of this research. Rain was low at both locations in 2011 with Maigana recording lower rainfall in the two years of this study when compared with Samaru.

Table - 1: Physical and Chemical Properties of soil (0-30cm) collected from the Experimental Sites

Soil Properties	Samaru		Maigana	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
Physical Properties				
Sand (g/kg)	222.00	240.00	192.00	520.00
Silt (g/kg)	474.00	540.00	504.00	380.00
Clay (g/kg)	304.00	220.00	304.00	100.00
Textural Class	Clay loam	Silt loam	Silty Clay loam	Sandy loam
Chemical Properties				
pH in 0.01M CaCl ₂	4.28	5.98	4.35	4.55
Organic Carbon (g/kg)	13.6	2.10	16.00	20.40
Total Nitrogen (g/kg)	1.70	9.00	2.20	10.10
Available P mg/Kg	3.05	1.42	4.48	2.84
Exchangeable Cation (cmol/kg)				
K	0.15	0.22	0.17	0.22
Mg	0.59	2.00	0.63	1.76
Ca	0.59	3.00	0.61	5.00
Na	7.32	1.60	9.10	1.60
CEC	4.28	5.20	4.35	2.90

Table - 2: Rainfall Distribution at Samaru and Maigana during 2011 and 2012 Cropping Seasons

MONTHS	Samaru		2011		2012		Maigana		2011		2012	
	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days	Amount of Rainfall	Rainy days
January	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
March	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
April	27.8	4	7.3	3	36.4	1	21.1	4				
May	123.3	11	263.4	15	63.4	8	109.6	14				
June	162.5	12	120.7	8	102.5	15	145.7	13				
July	223.9	14	165.3	12	113.2	12	150.4	15				
August	239.9	16	426.7	16	165.2	16	130.5	19				
September	113.8	12	270.3	17	89.1	19	191	18				
October	54	4	79.6	5	66.8	5	14.6	3				
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
TOTAL	945.2	73	1333.3	76	636.6	76	762.9	86				



Table – 3: Economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing method at Samaru in 2011 wet season.

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	No. of bags (100kg)	Average Price/bag 100kg ⁻¹ ₦	Total revenue (TR) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Total variable cost (TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Gross margin (TR- TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	1088.67	10.89	4500	48990.15	43000	5990.15	0.14
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	2413.08	24.13	4500	108588.60	43000	65588.60	1.53
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	1395.77	13.96	4500	62809.65	43000	19809.65	0.46
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	1517.92	15.18	4500	68306.40	48000	20306.40	0.42
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	1710.75	17.11	4500	76983.75	48000	28983.75	0.60
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	1895.43	18.95	4500	85294.35	48000	37294.35	0.78
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	1565.17	15.65	4500	70432.65	53000	17432.65	0.33
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	1699.48	16.99	4500	76476.60	53000	23476.60	0.44
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	1101.33	11.01	4500	49559.85	53000	-3440.15	-0.06
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	1666.58	16.67	4500	74996.10	43000	31996.10	0.74
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	3839.85	38.40	4500	172793.25	43000	129793.25	3.02
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	3084.17	30.84	4500	138787.65	43000	95787.65	2.23
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	2289.02	22.89	4500	103005.90	48000	55005.90	1.15
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	2994.75	29.95	4500	134763.75	48000	86763.75	1.81
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	2757.83	27.58	4500	124102.35	48000	76102.35	1.59
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	1876.5	18.77	4500	84442.50	53000	31442.50	0.59
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	2537.92	25.38	4500	114206.40	53000	61206.40	1.15
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	1279.67	12.80	4500	57585.15	53000	4585.15	0.09
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	917.33	9.17	5000	45866.50	43000	2866.50	0.07
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	1342.16	13.42	5000	67108.00	43000	24108.00	0.56
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	969.58	9.70	5000	48479.00	43000	5479.00	0.13
JAMILA	Drilling	40	868.01	8.68	5000	43400.50	48000	-4599.50	-0.10
JAMILA	Drilling	80	1080.83	10.81	5000	54041.50	48000	6041.50	0.13
JAMILA	Drilling	120	1094.85	10.95	5000	54742.50	48000	6742.50	0.14
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	967.85	9.68	5000	48392.50	53000	-4607.50	-0.09
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	1014.55	10.15	5000	50727.50	53000	-2272.50	-0.04
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	701.35	7.01	5000	35067.50	53000	-17932.50	-0.34

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.



Table – 4: Economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing method at Samaru in 2012 wet season.

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate kg ha ⁻¹	Total yield Kg ha ⁻¹	No. of bags (100kg)	Average Price/bag ₦	Total revenue (TR) ₦ ha ⁻¹	Total variable cost (TVC) ₦ ha ⁻¹	Gross margin (TR- TVC) ₦ ha ⁻¹	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	3125.00	31.25	4500	140625.00	45000	95625.00	2.13
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	3500.00	35.00	4500	157500.00	45000	112500.00	2.50
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	2833.33	28.33	4500	127499.85	45000	82499.85	1.83
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	3541.67	35.42	4500	159375.15	50000	109375.15	2.19
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	4208.33	42.08	4500	189374.85	50000	139374.85	2.79
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	4208.33	42.08	4500	189374.85	50000	139374.85	2.79
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	2708.33	27.08	4500	121874.85	55000	66874.85	1.22
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	2583.33	25.83	4500	116249.85	55000	61249.85	1.11
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	2875.00	28.75	4500	129375.00	55000	74375.00	1.35
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	3083.33	30.83	4500	138749.85	45000	93749.85	2.08
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	4666.67	46.67	4500	210000.15	45000	165000.15	3.67
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	3750.00	37.50	4500	168750.00	45000	123750.00	2.75
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	3583.33	35.83	4500	161249.85	50000	111249.85	2.22
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	5458.33	54.58	4500	245624.85	50000	195624.85	3.91
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	3958.33	39.58	4500	178124.85	50000	128124.85	2.56
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	4125.00	41.25	4500	185625.00	55000	130625.00	2.38
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	4125.00	41.25	4500	185625.00	55000	130625.00	2.38
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	3000.00	30.00	4500	135000.00	55000	80000.00	1.45
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	3208.00	32.08	5000	160400.00	45000	115400.00	2.56
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	4875.00	48.75	5000	243750.00	45000	198750.00	4.42
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	4791.67	47.92	5000	239583.50	45000	194583.50	4.32
JAMILA	Drilling	40	4875.00	48.75	5000	243750.00	50000	193750.00	3.88
JAMILA	Drilling	80	4208.33	42.08	5000	210416.50	50000	160416.50	3.21
JAMILA	Drilling	120	5150.00	51.50	5000	257500.00	50000	207500.00	4.15
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	3458.33	34.58	5000	172916.50	55000	117916.50	2.14
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	4833.33	48.33	5000	241666.50	55000	186666.50	3.39
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	3625.00	36.25	5000	181250.00	55000	126250.00	2.30

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.



Table - 5: Combined economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing method at Samaru in 2011 and 2012 wet seasons

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	No. of bags (100kg)	Average Price/bag ₦	Total revenue (TR) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Total variable cost (TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Gross margin (TR- TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	2106.83	21.07	4500	94807.35	44000	50807.35	2.15
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	2956.54	29.57	4500	133044.30	44000	89044.30	3.02
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	2114.55	21.15	4500	95154.75	44000	51154.75	2.16
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	2529.79	25.30	4500	113840.55	49000	64840.55	2.32
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	2959.54	29.60	4500	133179.30	49000	84179.30	2.72
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	3051.88	30.52	4500	137334.60	49000	88334.60	2.80
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	2136.75	21.37	4500	96153.75	54000	42153.75	1.78
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	2141.41	21.41	4500	96363.45	54000	42363.45	1.78
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	1988.17	19.88	4500	89467.65	54000	35467.65	1.66
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	2374.96	23.75	4500	106873.20	44000	62873.20	2.43
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	4226.54	42.27	4500	190215.00	44000	146215.00	4.32
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	3694.92	36.95	4500	166275.00	44000	122275.00	3.78
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	2936.18	29.36	4500	132128.10	49000	83128.10	2.70
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	4226.54	42.27	4500	190194.30	49000	141194.30	3.88
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	3358.08	33.58	4500	151113.60	49000	102113.60	3.08
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	3000.75	30.01	4500	135033.75	54000	81033.75	2.50
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	3331.46	33.31	4500	149915.70	54000	95915.70	2.78
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	2139.83	21.40	4500	96292.35	54000	42292.35	1.78
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	2062.83	20.63	5000	103141.50	44000	59141.50	2.34
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	3066.92	30.67	5000	153346.00	44000	109346.00	3.49
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	2922.29	29.22	5000	146114.50	44000	102114.50	3.32
JAMILA	Drilling	40	2871.51	28.72	5000	143575.50	49000	94575.50	2.93
JAMILA	Drilling	80	3804.58	38.05	5000	190229.00	49000	141229.00	3.88
JAMILA	Drilling	120	3122.43	31.22	5000	156121.50	49000	107121.50	3.19
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	2213.09	22.13	5000	110654.50	54000	56654.50	2.05
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	2923.94	29.24	5000	146197.00	54000	92197.00	2.71
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	2163.18	21.63	5000	108159.00	54000	54159.00	2.002

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.



Table – 6: Economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing methods at Maigana in 2011 wet season.

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	No. of bags (100kg)	Average Price/ bag ₦	Total revenue (TR) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Total variable cost (TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Gross margin (TR- TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	718.67	7.19	4500	32340.15	40000	-7659.85	-0.81
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	1451.20	14.51	4500	65304.00	40000	25304.00	1.63
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	946.10	9.46	4500	42574.50	40000	2574.50	1.06
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	1199.73	11.10	4500	53987.85	42000	11987.85	1.29
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	1372.73	13.73	4500	61772.85	42000	19772.85	1.47
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	732.80	7.33	4500	32976.00	42000	-9024.00	-0.79
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	818.72	8.19	4500	36842.40	44000	-7157.60	-0.84
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	1621.83	16.22	4500	72982.35	44000	28982.35	1.66
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	1119.62	11.20	4500	50382.90	44000	6382.90	1.15
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	1143.77	11.44	4500	51469.65	40000	11469.65	1.29
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	3231.63	32.32	5000	161581.50	42000	119581.50	3.85
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	637.02	6.37	4500	28665.90	40000	-11334.10	-0.72
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	1246.91	12.47	4500	56110.95	42000	14110.95	1.34
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	1618.5	16.19	4500	72832.50	42000	30832.50	1.73
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	634.83	6.35	4500	28567.35	42000	-13432.65	-0.68
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	933.33	9.33	4500	41999.85	44000	-2000.15	-0.95
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	1253.13	12.53	4500	56390.85	44000	12390.85	1.28
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	810.13	8.10	4500	36455.85	44000	-7544.15	-0.83
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	691.83	6.92	5000	34591.50	40000	-5408.50	-0.86
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	873.33	8.73	5000	43666.50	40000	3666.50	1.09
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	1000.00	10.00	5000	50000.00	40000	10000.00	1.25
JAMILA	Drilling	40	674.17	6.74	5000	33708.50	42000	-8291.50	-0.80
JAMILA	Drilling	80	1380.97	13.81	5000	69050.00	42000	27050.00	1.55
JAMILA	Drilling	120	808.57	8.09	5000	40428.50	42000	-1571.50	-0.96
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	873.00	8.73	5000	43650.00	44000	-350.00	-0.99
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	978.80	9.79	5000	48940.00	44000	4940.00	1.11
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	545.67	5.46	5000	27283.50	44000	-16716.50	-0.62

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.



Table – 7: Economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing method at Maigana in 2012 wet season.

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	No .of bags (100kg)	Average Price/ bag ₦	Total revenue (TR) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Total variable cost (TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Gross margin (TR- TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	2500.00	25.00	4500	112500.00	41000	71500.00	2.74
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	2916.67	29.17	4500	131250.15	41000	90250.15	3.20
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	3916.67	39.17	4500	176250.15	41000	135250.15	4.30
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	1666.67	16.67	4500	75000.15	43000	32000.15	1.74
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	2625.00	26.25	4500	118125.00	43000	75125.00	2.75
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	3425.00	34.25	4500	154125.00	43000	111125.00	3.58
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	2075.00	20.75	4500	93375.00	45000	48375.00	2.08
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	1750.00	17.50	4500	78750.00	45000	33750.00	1.75
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	1875.00	18.75	4500	84375.00	45000	39375.00	1.88
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	2000.00	20.00	4500	90000.00	41000	49000.00	2.20
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	4166.67	41.67	4500	187500.15	41000	146500.15	4.57
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	3375.00	33.75	4500	151875.00	41000	110875.00	3.70
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	1625.00	16.25	4500	73125.00	43000	30125.00	1.71
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	3000.00	30.00	4500	135000.00	43000	92000.00	3.14
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	3458.33	34.58	4500	155624.85	43000	112624.85	3.62
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	1541.67	15.42	4500	69375.15	45000	24375.15	1.54
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	2416.67	24.17	4500	108750.15	45000	63750.15	2.42
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	2375.00	23.75	4500	106875.00	45000	61875.00	2.38
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	2583.33	25.83	5000	129166.50	41000	88166.50	3.15
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	4333.33	43.33	5000	216666.50	41000	175666.50	5.28
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	3541.67	35.42	5000	177083.50	41000	136083.50	4.32
JAMILA	Drilling	40	2291.67	22.92	5000	114583.50	43000	71583.50	2.66
JAMILA	Drilling	80	5783.33	57.83	5000	289166.50	43000	246166.50	6.72
JAMILA	Drilling	120	4833.33	48.33	5000	241666.50	43000	198666.50	5.62
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	2916.67	29.17	5000	145833.50	45000	100833.50	3.24
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	3041.67	30.42	5000	152083.50	45000	107083.50	3.38
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	4375.00	43.75	5000	218750.00	45000	173750.00	4.86

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.



Table – 8: Combined economic analysis of cost and return on investment of growing upland rice varieties using seed rate and sowing method at Maigana in 2011 and 2012 wet seasons

Variety	Sowing method	Seed rate (kg ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	No. of bags (100kg)	Average Price/bag ₦	Total revenue (TR) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Total variable cost (TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Gross margin (TR- TVC) (₦ ha ⁻¹)	Return on investment (ROI) ₦
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	40	1609.33	16.09	4500	72419.85	40500	31919.85	1.79
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	80	2233.93	22.34	4500	100526.85	40500	60026.85	2.48
NERICA 4	Broadcasting	120	2431.38	24.31	4500	109412.10	40500	68912.10	2.70
NERICA 4	Drilling	40	1433.20	14.33	4500	64494.10	42500	21994.00	1.52
NERICA 4	Drilling	80	1998.87	19.99	4500	89949.15	42500	47449.15	2.12
NERICA 4	Drilling	120	2078.90	20.79	4500	93550.50	42500	51050.50	2.20
NERICA 4	Dibbling	40	1446.86	14.47	4500	65108.70	44500	20608.70	1.46
NERICA 4	Dibbling	80	1685.92	16.86	4500	75866.40	44500	31366.40	1.70
NERICA 4	Dibbling	120	1497.31	14.97	4500	67378.95	44500	22878.95	1.51
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	40	1571.88	15.72	4500	70734.60	40500	30234.60	1.75
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	80	2773.82	27.74	4500	124821.90	40500	84321.90	3.08
NERICA 8	Broadcasting	120	2006.01	20.06	4500	90270.45	40500	49770.45	2.23
NERICA 8	Drilling	40	1435.95	14.36	4500	64617.75	42500	22117.75	1.52
NERICA 8	Drilling	80	2309.25	23.09	4500	103916.25	42500	61416.25	2.45
NERICA 8	Drilling	120	2046.58	20.47	4500	92096.10	42500	49596.10	2.17
NERICA 8	Dibbling	40	1237.50	12.38	4500	55687.50	44500	11187.50	1.25
NERICA 8	Dibbling	80	1834.90	18.35	4500	82570.50	44500	38070.50	1.86
NERICA 8	Dibbling	120	1592.57	15.93	4500	71665.65	44500	27165.65	1.61
JAMILA	Broadcasting	40	1637.58	16.38	5000	81879.00	40500	41379.00	2.02
JAMILA	Broadcasting	80	2207.50	22.08	5000	110375.00	40500	69875.00	2.73
JAMILA	Broadcasting	120	2666.67	26.67	5000	133333.50	40500	92833.50	3.29
JAMILA	Drilling	40	1482.92	14.83	5000	74146.00	42500	31646.00	1.74
JAMILA	Drilling	80	4507.48	45.07	5000	225374.00	42500	182874.00	5.30
JAMILA	Drilling	120	2820.95	28.21	5000	141047.50	42500	98547.50	3.32
JAMILA	Dibbling	40	1894.83	18.95	5000	94741.50	44500	50241.50	2.13
JAMILA	Dibbling	80	2010.23	20.10	5000	100511.50	44500	56011.50	2.26
JAMILA	Dibbling	120	2460.33	24.60	5000	123016.50	44500	78516.50	2.76

Calculation of total revenue was based on market prevailing prices of ₦4,500.00 and ₦5000.00 per 100 kg bag of NERICAs and JAMILA respectively at Samaru and environs.

Conclusion

In this study, direct seeding of rice practice was evaluated and it is clear that direct seeded rice practices may not perform similarly in all agro ecological conditions because of rainfall distribution. At both location, the result indicated that the highest gross margin was by drilled JAMILA at 80 kg ha⁻¹

seed rate. The economic analysis of upland rice production at both locations indicated that production of NERICA 8 and JAMILA by either broadcasting or drilling method at the seed rate of 80 kg ha⁻¹ gave the highest gross margin as well as return on investment. The result revealed that NERICA 8 and JAMILA sown by broadcasting method at 80 kg ha⁻¹ was the most profitable with Gross margin of ₦246, 166.50



with return on investment of ₦6.72. This was followed by broadcasting JAMILA at 120 kg ha⁻¹ seed rate which gave a gross margin of ₦194, 583.50 and return on investment of ₦4.32. However, the least gross margin of ₦61, 249.85 was observed when NERICA 4 was dibbled at 120 kg ha⁻¹ which brought a loss of ₦16, 716.50 and ₦ 0.62k was lost per every naira invested. The data presented in the study shows that broadcasting and drilling method can also be a viable solution under scarcity of labour and water. but, there is need to develop proper weed management practices and requires further study to access the long term effects of herbicides on soil, water and development of weed flora.

References

- Anoop D, Khurana R, Jastarn S and Gususahib SD, 2007. Farm Power and Machinery, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana 141001. Comparative performance of Different Paddy Transplanter Development in India, A review. *Agric. Rev.* 28(4): 262-269.
- Azmi M, Chin DV, Vongsaraj P and Johnson DE, 2005. Emerging Issues in Weed Management of Direct-Seeded Rice in Malaysia, Vietnam, and Thailand. In *Rice is Life: Scientific Perspectives for the 21st Century*. K. Toriyama, K.L. Heong (eds), Tokyo and Tsukuba, Japan. Proceedings of the World Rice Research Conference pp. 196-198.
- Bhusan L, Ladha JK, Gupta RK, Singh S Tirole-Padre A, Sehrawat YS, Gathala M and Pathak H, 2007. Saving of water and labour in rice-wheat system with no tillage and direct seeding technologies. *Agron. J.* 99: 1288-1296.
- Chuhan BS, 2012. Weed ecology and weed management strategy for dry seeded rice in Asia. *Weed Technol.* 26: 1-13.
- Estorninos Jr. LE and Moody K, 1988. Evaluation of herbicides for weed control in dry-seeded wetland rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Philipp. J. Weed Sci.* 15: 50-58.
- FAO, 2009. FAOSTAT Database FAO, Rome www.faostat.fao.org (accessed in June 2010).
- Hira GS, 2009. Water Management in Northern and food Security of Indian. *J. Crop Improve.* 23: 36-47.
- Inyat Ali R, Nadeem I, Usman MS and Akhtar M, 2012. Effect of different planting methods on economic yield and grain quality of rice. *Int. J. Agri. Sci.* 4(1): 28-34.
- Kumar V, Ladha JK and Gathala MK, 2009. Direct drill-seeded rice: A need of the day. In Annual Meeting of Agronomy Society of America, Pittsburgh, November 1-5, 2009, <http://a-c-s.confex.com/crops/2009am/webprogram/Paper53386.html>
- Kumar V and Ladha JK, 2011 Direct seeding of rice: Recent developments and future research needs. *Advances in Agron.* 111: 297-413.
- Kumar R. 2011. Comparative performance evaluation of mechanical transplanting and direct seeding of rice under puddled and unpuddled condition. MTech Thesis, Deptt. of Farm Machinery and Power Engineering, CCS HAU, Hisar, Haryana, India.
- Mahajan G, Bharaj TS and Timsina J, 2009. Yield and water productivity of rice as affected by time of transplanting in Punjab, India. *Agri. Water Manage.* 96: 525-532.
- Kimio I, Ko N and Hiromitsu K, 1999. An Automatic Irrigation System for Direct Seeding. *Rice Cultivation. J. Agri. Meteorol.* 55(2): 127-135.
- Johnson D, 2006. The Direct Approach. *Rice Today* 5(2). International Rice Research Institute Rogers, E.M. 1995. Diffusion of Innovations. 4th ed. New York: The Free Press.
- Rao AN, Johnson DE, Shivaprasad B, Ladha JK and Mortimer AM, 2007. Weed management in direct-seeded rice. *Adv. Agron.* 93: 153-255.
- Reeves T, 2009. The impacts of climate change on wheat production in India – adaptation, mitigation and future directions. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome. Hobbs, P Present Practices and Future Options. *J. Crop Prod.* 4(1): 1-22.
- Saharawat YS, Singh B, Malik RK, Ladha JK, Gathala M, Jat ML and Kumar V, 2010. Evaluation of alternative tillage and crop establishment methods in a rice-wheat rotation in North Western IGP. *Field Crops Res.* 116: 260-267.
- Khush GS, 1997. Origin, dispersal, cultivation and variation of rice. *Plant Mol. Biol.* 35: 25-34.
- Santhi PK, Pannuswamy and Kempuchetty N, 1998. A labour saving techniques in direct sown and transplanted rice. *Int. Rice Res. Notes.* 23: 35-36.
- Singh Y, Singh B, Nayyar VK and Singh J, 2003. Nutrient management for sustainable rice-wheat cropping system. NATP, ICAR, New Delhi and PAU, Ludhiana, Punjab, India.
- Olukosi JO and Erhabor PO, 1988. Introduction to Farm Management Economics. Ajitab Publishers, Zaria, pp. 35-36 and 71-80.



Von Braun J and Bos MS, 2004. The changing economics and politics of rice: Implications for food security, globalization, and environmental sustainability. In “Rice Is Life: Scientific Perspectives for the 21st Century” (K. Toriyama, K. L. Heong, and B. Hardy, Eds.), pp. 7–20. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños,

Philippines and Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences, Tsukuba, Japan.
Yamano T, Aroma A, Labarta RA, Huelgas ZM and Mohanty S, 2016. Adoption and impacts of International rice research technologies. *Global Food Sec.* 8: 1-8.

