

Analyses of Cost and Revenue of Wheat Crop Production in District Musakhail, Balochistan

Muhammad Naeem¹ Syed Gul Shah² Mansoor Rasheed¹

1. Department of Agricultural Economics Balochistan Agriculture College Quetta.

2. Division of Basic Sciences (Physics) Balochistan Agriculture College Quetta.

Abstract

The study was conducted in Musakhail district of Balochistan Pakistan to analyse the cost benefit ratio of wheat crop. Total 40 wheat growers were selected for the study to find out the estimate costs and revenues of wheat production and share of different input costs in total cost of production of wheat in the study area. The study reveals that majority 19 (47.5%) of the respondents were of age group 31-40, while 7 (17.5%), 10 (20.0%), and 4 (10.0%) growers were of age group 21-30 and 41-50 and 51-60 years or above respectively. Based on the literacy level, farmers of the study area were categorized into 5 groups. First group was illiterate, while second, third, fourth and fifth groups were of education level 1-5 years, 6-8 years, 9-10 years, 11-12 years, and 13-16 years respectively. It was found that out of total 40 farmers, 14 (35.0%) were illiterate while 6 (15.0%), 4 (10%), and 11 (27.0%) 1 (2.5%) and 4 (10.0%) were having education level of 1-5 years, 6-8 years, 9-10 years, 10-12 and 13-16 years respectively. The average seed rate for wheat was 48.20 kg per acre in the study area. Cost of production of wheat was found to be Rs. 39265.0 per acre. The major factor of cost of production of wheat was labour cost of Rs. 8392.5 having 21.37% share in the total cost of production while the other factors of cost of production for wheat were seed cost, urea cost, DAP cost, farmyard manure cost, irrigation cost, chemical cost, Land preparation cost, threshing cost, marketing cost, and land rent (4.27%), (4.94%), (8.08%), (9.17%), (5.23%), (2.11%), (10.94%), (7.83%), (7.56%) and (18.48%) share in the total cost of production respectively. Majority of wheat growers (50.0%) were found to be facing by quality seed availability problem as their major problem on first priority while 27.5%, 15.0%, 37.5%, and 22.5% were facing pest control problem, Irrigation problem, marketing problem and other problems on their first priority respectively.

Keywords: Cost, Revenue, Wheat, Production, Musakhail.

Introduction

Agriculture sector has a vital role in Pakistan's economy. Being the second largest sector it has a contribution of over 21 % in the GDP of Pakistan, and employs 45 % of the country's total labor force. The importance of agriculture to the economy is seen in three ways: first, it provides food to consumers for food security and fiber for domestic industry; second, it is a source of scarce foreign exchange earnings; and third, it provides input and output market for industrial goods [Government of Pakistan (GoP), 2010].

Agriculture sector is the most important sector of Pakistan's economy like many other developing countries of the world and the most important agricultural product of the country is wheat. About 80% of the farmers that are more than four million and close to 40% of the total cropped area which contributes about quarter of the total crop sector value added production. (Coleman and Faruquee, 1996).

Wheat being staple food grain of Pakistan provides about 72 percent of the total calories and protein in average diet. According to Pakistan Agricultural Research Council the per capita wheat consumption in the country is 120 kg a year which is considered to be one of the highest in the world (Pakistan Agricultural Research Council, 1989).

Wheat is the essential diet of population and occupies a central position in agricultural policies of the government. The government announced wheat support price of Rs. 1200 which created interest on the part of farming community. Wheat contributes 10.1 percent to the value added in agriculture and 2.2 percent to GDP. Area under wheat 2012-13, from 8693 thousand hectares showing an increase of 0.5 percent over last year's area. The production stood at 24.2 million tons during 2012-13, against the target of 25.5 million tones which is 5.1 percent decrease while an increase of 3.2 percent over the last year production of 23.5 million tones has been witnessed. The yield per hectare in 2012-13 stood at 2787 (kgs/hect) posted a positive growth of 2.7 percent as compared to negative 4.2 percent growth last year. The overall increase in area due to enhancement in support price from Rs. 1050 to Rs. 1200. This was further supported by favorable temperature and healthy grain formation [Government of Pakistan (GoP), 2013].

Objectives of the study

1. To estimate costs and revenues of wheat production in the study area.
2. To assess the percentage share of different input costs in total cost of production of wheat in the study area.

Materials and Methods

The study was carried out in district Musakhail of Balochistan. three villages were selected purposively for research studies that were Durug, Nath and Gargogi. These villages were easy to approach and most of the people in these villages were farmers by profession. Total 40 farmers of wheat were selected to be interviewed for the estimation of cost and revenue of wheat production in study area. Most of the data used for the study was primary data which was collected through a pre-designed interview schedule. The total cost and net returns of the sampled respondent were established using the following formula (Varion, 1992).

$$TC_i = \sum P_{X_i} * X_i \quad (3.1)$$

Where:

$$TR_i = P_{Y_i} * Y_i \quad (3.2)$$

$$NR_i = TR_i - TC_i \quad (3.3)$$

NR_i = Net revenue of i th farmer of wheat crop in the study area. (Rs acr^{-1}).

TC_i = Total cost of production of the respected crop of i th farmer (Rs acr^{-1}).

TR_i = Total revenue of the respected crop of i th farmer (Rs acr^{-1}).

P_{Y_i} = Price of output of the i th farmer (Rs acr^{-1}).

Y_i = Quantity of output produced by the i th farmer (Kg acr^{-1}).

P_{X_i} = Prices of inputs of i th farmer (Rs Unit $^{-1}$).

X_i = Quantities of inputs applied by the i th farmer (Kg acr^{-1}).

Results And Discussion

3.1 Age wise distribution of the respondents in the study area

All the respondents were divided into 4 groups of different ages (Table 4.2). First group contained the respondent of age 21-30 years; the second group was of age 31-40 years. The third and fourth groups contained the respondents of age 41-50 and 51-60 years respectively.

It was discovered from the collected data that there were 7 (17.5%) respondents in the first age group (21-30 years), out of which 2, 3, and 2 were from Drug, Nath and Gargogi village respectively. The second age group (31-40 years) had 19 (47.5%) respondents, out of which 7, 5, and 7 were from Drug, Nath and Gargogi village respectively. There were 10 (20.0%) respondents in the third age group (41-50 years) out of which 5, 1 and 4 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. The last age group (51-60 years) contained 4(10.0%), respondents out of which 1, 1, and 2 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively.

3.2 Tenancy status of the respondents in the study area

The farmers of the study area were categorized into 3 groups based on their tenancy status i.e. owner, tenant and owner-cum-tenant. Tenancy status of the farmers of both crops is indicated in the table 4.1. It is evident from the table that 24 (60.0%) farmers of the study area were owners out of which 8, 7 and 9 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. The number of tenants in the study area was found to be 14 (95.0%), out of which 6, 3 and 5 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. Similarly the number of owner-cum-tenants in the study area was 2 (100.0%) out of which 1, 0 and 1 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively.

3.3 Educational level of the respondents in the study area

Education is an important demographic factor. It influences the decisions of a farmer regarding the cultivation of the crops, techniques and input decisions etc (Perration, 1981). The educational level was divided into 6 groups, first group was the illiterate group. Second group was having educational level 1-5 years, the third group was having educational level 6-8 years, and the fourth group was having educational level 9-10 fifth group was having educational level 11-12 year sixth group was having educational level 13-16 year. Table 3.3 shows the educational level of the respondents of all three villages. It is depicted by the table that there were 14 (35.0%) farmers who were illiterate, out of which 2, 4 and 8 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. The number of the farmers who had educational level of 1-5 years was 6 (15.0%) out of which 4, 1 and 1 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. The farmers having educational level of 6-8 years were 4 (10.0%) out of which 2, 1 and 1 belonged to Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively. The number having educational level of 9-10 or years consisted of 11 (27.5%) farmers, out of which, 5, 3 and 3 belonged Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages respectively, The number having educational level of 10-12 or years consisted of only 1 (2.5%) farmers, out who belonged to Gargogi village respectively, The last group having educational level of 12-16 or above years consisted of 4 (10.0%) farmers, out of which, 2, 1 and 1 belonged Drug, Nath and Gargogi villages. Lower level of education in the study area might be due to lack of awareness about education (Ishaq, *et al.* 2007) or poverty might also be a factor for low literacy rate (Khan *et al.* 2006).

3.4 Land holding size of the respondents in the study

The respondents of the study area were asked about their total land holding. Table 4.4 depicts the information

about the landholding size of the respondents in the study area. It was found that out of 40 farmers, 11 possessed the land of 1 acre while 18, 8, 2 and 1 were those who possessed 2 acres, 3 acres, 5 acres and 10 acres of land respectively.

3.5 Land holding size under wheat cultivation of the respondents in the study area

Table 4.4 provides information about the area under wheat cultivation in the study area. It is revealed through the table that the area under wheat cultivation was 65, out of which 25 acres in village Drug, 13 acres in village Nath and 27 acres in village Gargogi. In terms of seed rate, on average 51.44 kg of seed was used per acre for wheat cultivation. The higher area under wheat cultivation might be due to the fact that wheat is a staple food crop of area (Khan *et al.* 2006).

3.6 Cost of production of wheat per acre in the study area

Cost of production of a crop is the total cost incurred for raising that crop. It included the pre and post harvest activities and their costs or charges. In the present study factors of cost of production of wheat are seed cost, land preparation cost, fertilizers cost, chemicals cost, irrigation cost, threshing cost, labour cost, land rent and marketing cost etc.

3.6.1 Seed cost

Seed and its cost play an important role in the production of a crop. The data collected in the study revealed that the average seed cost was Rs. 1677.4 total cost of wheat, respectively (Table 3.6). The prices of seed were fluctuating during the study due to demand and supply condition of market. The findings about seed cost are in agreement with that of Lambert, 1997.

3.6.2 Fertilizer cost

Fertilizers are very important for raising a good crop. Fertilizers enhance soil fertility and result in good and high yield of a crop. In the study area, most of the farmers were using urea DAP and farm yard manure as fertilizers. Table 3.6 shows that the average fertilizer cost was Rs. 1941.2, Rs. 3172.5 and Rs 3600.0 for urea DAP and farm yard manure as fertilizers for wheat cultivation in the study area. The fertilizers improve production of wheat on per acre basis (Sabbur and Rehman, 1993).

3.6.3 Irrigation cost

Irrigation cost may be the Abiana, or the cost of fuel/energy used for extracting water from the ground. In the study area, all farmers were using diesel engines to extract water from the ground for irrigation. The average cost of irrigation in the study area was Rs. 2055.0 for wheat.

3.6.4 Chemicals

The chemicals are used in the fields to protect the crop from pests, weeds and harmful insects that deteriorate and reduce the quality and quantity of a crop. Chemicals are considered harmful for the environment, but still they are widely used as they provide immediate results against pests. Table 3.6 shows that the average cost of chemicals for wheat was Rs. 828.5 in the study area. The findings of this study are in agreement with that of Khan *et al.* 2007.

3.6.5 Land preparation cost

The land preparation cost is the cost that is incurred for preparing the land for a specific crop. It includes the tractor hours ploughing, tilling, bullock days, labours used etc and the bullock use for leveling, tilling and ploughing the field where tractor cannot operate. Table 3.6 reveals that tractor cost on average basis incurred for wheat was Rs. 4297.5 The higher cost of tractor hours and bullock use was due to more and deep plougings required by wheat for a good uniform emergence of the crop

3.6.6 Labour cost

Labour cost includes the actions and activities of the labour in crop production such as handling of crop, application of chemicals, irrigation, pre and post harvest activities etc. Table 4.7 shows that the average labour cost for wheat was found to be Rs. 8392.5. Higher labour cost for wheat was due to more laborious activities.

3.6.7 Threshing cost

Threshing cost is cost incurred for threshing the produce. In the study area, the threshing cost was not monetary, but it was in kind i.e. there was a share for threshing out of total threshed crop. For this study the farmers were asked to estimate the cost of share that they paid for threshing. The table 3.6 shows the information about the threshing cost of the crops. Threshing cost was found to be Rs. 3076.3 in the study area.

3.6.8 Marketing cost

The marketing cost includes the costs that are incurred for loading, unloading, weighing, packing and transporting etc the produce. Table 3.6 shows that the average marketing cost was Rs. 2969.5 for wheat respectively in the study area.

3.6.9 Land rent

Land rent is of two types, first is determined by the owner's willingness while second is the opportunity cost that is earned by the best alternative way. In this study first type of land rent was included that is determined by the farmers. Table 3.6 shows that the average land rent was found to be Rs. 7255.0 for wheat in the study area.

3.6.10 Total cost of wheat production

The total cost of production of a crop includes cost of inputs and cost incurred for marketing that produce. Table 3.6 shows the total cost of wheat production in the study area. The total cost of production on average basis was found to be Rs. 39265.0 per acre. The total cost of production for wheat was higher due to the higher amounts of fertilizer and inputs used.

3.7 Per acre average output, market price, gross and net revenues of wheat in the study area

The average per acre output of wheat in the study area is provided in table 3.7 along with the average market price of output of crop. The average output of wheat main product (Grain) was 1484 kg per acre with a market price of Rs. 26.37 per kg while the average output of wheat by product (Bhoosa) was 1191 kg per acre with a market price of Rs. 4.94 per kg. The average gross revenue of wheat production (main product and by product) was Rs. 55027.50 per acre while the net revenue of wheat was Rs. 15762.50 per acre in the study area

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

3.8 Response of the respondents towards preferring factors of wheat cultivation

The preferring factors regarding wheat cultivation on priority basis in the study area are presented in table 3.8.

3.8.1 Trend

It is revealed through table 3.8 that out of total 40 growers of wheat, 11 were growing wheat as trend on first priority while, 11, 4, 10 and 15 were growing wheat as trend on second, third and fourth priority respectively.

3.8.2 Economical cultivation

Table 3.8 indicates that out of total 40 sampled farmers of wheat, 8 were growing wheat for its economical cultivation at first priority while 8, 2, 20, and 10 were growing wheat for its economical cultivation on second priority, third priority, and fourth priority respectively.

3.8.3 Personal use

It is evident from the table 3.8 that out of total 40 growers of wheat 18 were growing wheat for their personal use at first priority while it was the second, third and fourth priority of 18, 12, 6 and 4 growers respectively.

3.8.4 Marketing

Table 4.8 shows that out of total 40 wheat growers, 15 were growing wheat for marketing purpose on first priority while 8, 12, 15 and 5 were growing it on second, third and fourth priority respectively.

3.8.5 Seed source

It is clear from the table 3.8 that out of total 40 wheat growers, 11 were growing wheat for seed source on first priority while 11, 11, 10 and 8 were growing wheat for the same purpose on second, third and fourth priority respectively.

3.8.6 Other

It is indicated from table 3.8 that out of total 40 wheat growers, 13 were growing wheat for other purposes such as crop rotation, change in cropping pattern and by-product etc on first priority while 13, 13 and 10 were growing wheat for other purposes on second, third, and fourth priority respectively.

3.9 Response of the respondents towards problems associated with wheat cultivation

Major problems of wheat cultivation were enquired from the farmers of the study area. Table 3.9 describes the major problems faced by the wheat growers in the study area.

3.9.1 Quality seed availability problem

Table 3.9 indicates that out of total 40 wheat growers, 20 were facing quality seed availability problem at first priority while 20, 5, 13 and 12 were facing the same problem on second, third, fourth and fifth priority respectively.

3.9.2 Pest control problem

It is evident from the table 3.9 that out of total 40 wheat growers, 15 were facing pest control problem as their major problem on first priority while 11, 15, 5 and 9 were facing pest control problem on second, third, fourth and fifth priority respectively.

3.9.3 Irrigation problem

It is revealed through table 3.9 that out of total 40 growers of wheat, 20 were facing irrigation as a major problem on first priority while 6, 6, 20 and 8 were facing irrigation problem on second, third, fourth and fifth priority respectively.

3.9.4 Marketing Problem

Table 3.9 shows that out of total 40 growers of wheat, 15 were facing marketing problem on first priority while 17, 7, 3 and 15 were facing the same problem on second, third, fourth and fifth priority respectively.

3.9.5 Other problem

Other problems include high prices of inputs, lack of modern technology, and shortage of inputs in season etc. It is discovered from the table 3.9 that out of total 40 growers of wheat, 11 were facing other problems at first priority while 9, 11, 10 and 10 were facing the same problem on second third, fourth and fifth priority respectively.

Conclusion

Wheat crop is the edible seed grain crops of district Musakhail of Balochistan. This crop is grown in the rabbi season. Wheat is mainly grown as a staple food crop. Most of the growers of wheat crop were illiterate. In all villages, majority 19 (47.5%) of the farmers were of age 31-40 years. Major factors of cost of production of wheat (in order of share) were labour cost, land rent, land preparation cost, farmyard manure cost, DAP cost, threshing cost, marketing cost, irrigation cost, urea cost, seed cost and chemical cost. The output of wheat was found to be (1484 kg per acre). The gross revenue and net revenue was found to be Rs. 55027.50 and Rs. 15762.0 per acre of wheat production in the study area.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study following recommendations are being suggested to improve the efficiency of the wheat growers in the study area.

1. The farmers of the study area should be trained by extension workers so that they acquire new information, technology and better cultivation techniques and enhance their efficiency in agriculture. For this purpose more and more visits of the official to farmers and extension services should be provided in the study area.
2. Major problems such as indicated by the farmer in this study should be addressed on priority basis by the related officials.
3. Agriculture credit facilities should be provided in the study area so that the poor farmers could benefit from them to afford high quality inputs and consequently improves their efficiency.
4. Similar studies need to be replicated in other districts of the country where wheat is grown as major edible food grain crop.

5. Literature Cited

6. Arif, S. and Y. Kaya. 2009. The Components of Production Cost in Sunflower and its Relationships with Input Prices. International Conference on Applied Economics – ICOAE 2009, pp. 593-600.
7. Chaudhry, S. M. and S. Kamal. 1997. *Introduction to statistical theory part II*. Ilmi kitabkhana, Lahore. pp. 239-272.
8. Coleman, J. R. and R. Faruquee. 1996. Managing Price Risk in Pakistan Wheat Market. World Bank Discussion Papers, Vol. 334, pp. 1-14.
9. GoP. 2010. Pakistan Economic Survey Ministry of Finance, Economic advisor's wing, finance division, Islamabad, Pakistan.
10. Ishaq M, A. Farooq and S. H. Saddozai. 2007. Trend and Rate of Growth in Wheat during 2004-05 and 2005-06. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*. 23(3): 823-828.
11. Jan, B., Qamaruz Z. and G. N. Bangash. 2000. Regression Analysis of Wheat Production in NWFP. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture* 16(1):111-115.
12. Jariko, G. A., M. A. Junejo, M. S. Rahpoto, and M. Z. Shah. 2011. Socioeconomic Factors Affecting Adoption of Sunflower Varieties in Sindh. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*. 2011 Vol. 5 (1), 192-201.
13. Khalil, I. A. and A. Jan. 2000. Cereal crops in cropping technology. National Book Foundation Islamabad. Pp 169-203.
14. Khan, I. 2011. Wheat and barseem cultivation: a comparison of profitability in district Peshawar. Unpublished M.Sc (Hon) thesis submitted to the Department of Agricultural Economic, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Agricultural University Peshawar.
15. Khan, N. Z., M. Ahmad and A. Rasheed. 2007. Wheat Production in Pakistan: Saga of Policy Disincentive. *Pakistan Development Review*, 42(1): 1-27.
16. Khan, M, S. and S. Axel. 2006. Inflation in Pakistan. Money or Wheat? IMF Working Paper. 1-28, available at SSRN.
17. M. S. Rahman, M. A. Monayem Miah, Moniruzzaman and S. Hossain. 2011. Impact of Farm Mechanization on Labour use for Wheat Cultivation in Northern
18. P. M. Nyangweso, O. O. Paul, M. Z. Mapelu, and M. O. Odhiambo. 2010. Forecasting Wheat Output and Profits from Cropping Systems Using Simulation Models in Uasin Gishu, Kenya. Contributed Paper presented at 48th Agricultural Economists Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference, Cape Town, South Africa, September 19-23, 2010.
19. Pakistan Agricultural Research Council. 1989. Wheat Research and Development in Pakistan. Islamabad.
20. Varian, H. R. (1992): *Microeconomic Analysis*, third Edition. New York and London: W.W. Norton.

Table 1.1: Area, Production and yield of wheat

Year	Area		Production		Yield	
	(000hectres)	% Change	(000 tonnes)	% Change	(Kg/ha)	% Change
2008-09	9046	-	24033	-	2657	-
2009-10	9132	1.0	23311	-3.0	2553	-3.9
2010-11	8901	-2.5	25214	8.2	2833	11.0
2011-12	8650	-2.8	23473	-6.9	2714	-4.2
2012-13 (P)	8693	0.5	24231	3.2	2787	2.7

Source: GoP, 2013.

Table 3.1 Age wise distribution of the respondents in the study area

Village	Age (year)				Total
	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60 or above	
Drug	2	7	5	1	15
Nath	3	5	1	1	10
Gargogi	2	7	4	2	15
Total	7	19	10	4	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table 3.2 Tenancy status of the respondents in the study area

Area Name	Tenancy Status			Total
	Owner-cum-tenant	Owner	Tenant	
Drug	1	8	6	15
Nath	0	7	3	10
Gargogi	1	9	5	15
Total	2	24	14	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table 4.4 Educational level of respondents in the study area

Area Name	Educational level						Total
	Illiterate	1-5	6-8	9-10	11-12	13-16	
Drug	2	4	2	5	0	2	15
Nath	4	1	1	3	0	1	10
Gargogi	8	1	1	3	1	1	15
Total	14	6	4	11	1	4	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table: 3.4 Land holding size of the respondents in the study

Area Name	Land holding size					Total
	1 acre	2 acre	3 acre	5 acre	10 acre	
Drug	4	9	1	1	0	15
Nath	7	0	1	1	1	10
Gargogi	0	9	6	0	0	15
Total	11	18	8	2	1	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table 3.5 Land holding size under wheat cultivation of the respondents in the study area

Area Name	Land holding size under wheat cultivation				Total
	1 acre	2 acre	3 acre	4 acre	
Drug	7 (38.9)	7 (35.0)	0 (00.0)	1 (100)	15 (37.5)
Nath	8 (44.4)	1 (5.0)	1 (100)	0 (00.0)	10 (25.0)
Gargogi	3 (16.7)	12 (60.0)	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	15 (37.5)
Total	18 (100)	20 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	40 (100)

Source: Survey Data, 2014. (the data in parenthesis are percentages)

Table 3.6 Per acre cost of production of wheat in the study area

Input	Unit	Cost	Percentage
Seed (Kg)	48.20	1677.4	4.27
Urea (Kg)	52.50	1941.2	4.94
DAP (Kg)	39.62	3172.5	8.08
Farmyard Manure (Trolley)	0.77	3600.0	9.17
Irrigations (No.)	5.00	2055.0	5.23
Chemical (Kg/Lit)	0.91	828.50	2.11
Tractor (Hours)	4.01	4297.5	10.94
Labor (L.Days)	16.00	8392.5	21.37
Threshing (Rs.)	--	3076.3	7.83
Marketing (Rs.)	--	2969.5	7.56
Land rent (Rs.)	--	7255.0	18.48
Total Cost (Rs.)	--	39265.00	100.00

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table 3.7 Per acre average output, market price, gross and net revenues of wheat in the study area

Output	Unit	Revenue (Rs.)
Output Main Product (Kg)	1484	49135.00
Output by Product (Kg)	1191	5892.50
Gross Output (Kg)	2677	55027.50
Net Revenue		15762.50

Table 3.8 Response of the respondents towards preferring factors of wheat cultivation

Priorities	Preferring factors regarding wheat cultivation					
	Trend	Economical cultivation	Personal use	Marketing	Seed source	Other
First	11	8	18	8	11	13
Second	4	2	12	12	11	13
Third	10	20	6	15	10	4
Fourth	15	10	4	5	8	10
Total	40	40	40	40	40	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.

Table 3.9 Response of the respondents towards problems associated with wheat cultivation

Priorities	Major problems faced by wheat growers				
	Quality seed availability problem	Pest control problem	Irrigation problem	Marketing problem	Other problem
First	20	11	6	15	9
Second	5	15	6	7	11
Third	13	9	20	3	10
Fourth	12	5	8	15	10
Total	40	40	40	40	40

Source: Survey Data, 2014.