



สถาบันวิจัยและพัฒนา

1986 CROP YEAR RICE PRODUCTION SURVEY
 IN THE PROJECT AREAS OF THE
 THAI-GERMAN HIGHLAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Prasert Bhandhachat, Project Director

G. Lamar Robert
 Sinth Sarobol
 Ronald D. Renard

Submitted to the

Thai-German Highland Development Programme
 Chiang Mai, Thailand

Payap Research and Development Center
 Payap University
 Chiang Mai, Thailand

April 1987

Table of Contents

	Page
1986 CROP YEAR RICE PRODUCTION SURVEY	1
PART I. FARMERS WHO RECEIVED TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES/TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	3
Section 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEYED POPULATION	3
Section 2. RICE YIELD DATA	7
Section 3. FARMERS' ATTITUDES	21
PART II. FARMERS WHO RECEIVED NEITHER TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES NOR TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	27
Section 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEYED POPULATION	27
Section 2. RICE YIELD DATA	30
Section 3. FARMERS' ATTITUDES	59
SUMMARY	64
KEY POINTS: FARMERS WHO RECEIVED TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES/TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	64
KEY POINTS: FARMERS WHO RECEIVED NEITHER TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES NOR TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	66
APPENDIX: RICE PRODUCTION MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	71

List of Tables

	Page
PART I. FARMERS WHO RECEIVED TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES/TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	
Table 1. DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY PROJECT AREA	2
Table 2. DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY ETHNIC GROUP	2
Table 3. DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY VILLAGE	4
Table 4. DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY EDUCATION LEVEL	4
Table 5. DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY AGE GROUP	5
Table 6. PLACE OF TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	5
Table 7. MONTH OF TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION	6
Table 8. AMOUNT OF RICE SEED RECEIVED FROM TG-HDP	6
Table 9. KNOWLEDGE OF TG-HDP ACTIVITIES	7
Table 10. SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF TG-HDP ACTIVITIES	7
Table 11. MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI (GROUPED)	8
Table 12. MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI (UNGROUPED)	8
Table 13. Crosstabulation: MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI BY ETHNIC GROUP	9
Table 18. VARIETY OF RICE PLANTED	9
Table 19. YEAR FIELD FIRST PLANTED (NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED)	10
Table 20. PLANTING METHOD	10
Table 21. NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED	11

Table 22.	Crosstabulation: NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED BY ETHNIC GROUP	12
Table 23.	Crosstabulation: NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED BY PROJECT AREA	13
Table 24.	FIRST WEEDING: DAYS AFTER PLANTING (GROUPED)	14
Table 25.	FIRST WEEDING: DAYS AFTER PLANTING (UNGROUPED)	15
Table 26.	TOOLS USED FOR FIRST WEEDING	15
Table 27.	SECOND WEEDING: DAYS AFTER FIRST WEEDING (GROUPED)	16
Table 28.	SECOND WEEDING: DAYS AFTER FIRST WEEDING (UNGROUPED)	16
Table 29.	TOOL USED FOR SECOND WEEDING	17
Table 30.	THIRD WEEDING: DAYS AFTER SECOND WEEDING (GROUPED)	17
Table 31.	THIRD WEEDING: DAYS AFTER SECOND WEEDING	17
Table 32.	TOOLS USED FOR THIRD WEEDING	18
Table 33.	USE OF FERTILIZER	18
Table 34.	ABILITY/WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE FERTILIZER	19
Table 35.	PROBLEMS WITH CROP PESTS	20
Table 36.	NATURE OF CROP PEST PROBLEMS	21
Table 37.	USE OF PESTICIDES	21
Table 38.	FARMERS' ASSESSMENT OF TG-HDP VS. LOCAL VARIETY YIELDS	22
Table 39.	FARMERS' DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE SEED	22
Table 40.	REASON FOR DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE VARIETY	23
Table 41.	Crosstabulation: REASON DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE VARIETY BY ETHNIC GROUP	23
Table 42.	REASON DO NOT DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE VARIETY	25

Table 43.	BENEFIT OF TG-HDP ADIVICE ON RICE PRODUCTION	26
Part II. FARMERS WHO RECEIVED NEITHER TG-HDP RICE VARIETIES NOR TG-HDP TRAINING ON RICE PRODUCTION		
Table 1.	DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY PROJECT AREA	27
Table 2.	DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY ETHNIC GROUP	28
Table 3.	DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY VILLAGE	28
Table 4.	DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY EDUCATION LEVEL	29
Table 5.	DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEYED FARMERS BY AGE	29
Table 6.	KNOWLEDGE OF TG-HDP ACTIVITIES	30
Table 7.	SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF TG-HDP ACTIVITIES	30
Table 8.	MEASURED AVERAGE RICE YIELD PER RAI (BASED ON MEASUREMENTS OF THREE 25 SQUARE METER PLOTS PER FIELD)	31
Table 9.	MEASURED AVERAGE RICE YIELD PER RAI (EXTRAPOLATED FROM INDIVIDUAL 25 SQUARE METER PLOT MEASURES	31
Table 10.	MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI BY ETHNIC GROUP	32
Table 11.	Crosstabulation: MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI BY PROJECT AREA	33
Table 12.	VARIETY OF RICE PLANTED (MANY ARE TRANSLITTERATIONS OF HILLTRIBE LANGUAGES)	34
Table 13.	YEAR FIELD FIRST PLANTED (NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED)	35
Table 14.	Crosstabulation: NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED BY MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI	36
Table 15.	FIRST CROP 1985	37
Table 16.	SECOND CROP 1985	37
Table 17.	FIRST CROP 1984	37

Table 18.	SECOND CROP 1984	37
Table 19.	FIRST CROP 1983	38
Table 20.	SECOND CROP 1983	38
Table 21.	CROPPING SYSTEM IN 1985	38
Table 22.	AVERAGE SLOPE OF INDIVIDUALLY MEASURED 25 SQUARE METER PLOTS	39
Table 23.	DENSITY OF WEEDS	39
Table 24.	Crosstabulation: DENSITY OF WEEDS BY MEASURD RICE YIELD PER RAI	40
Table 25.	NUMBER OF CLUMPS PER SQUARE METER	42
Table 26.	AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS	42
Table 27.	Crosstabulation: AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS BYMEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI	43
Table 28.	Multiple Regression Equation - MEASURED RICE YIELD PER RAI BY AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS AND AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS SQUARED	44
Table 29.	Multiple Regression - AVERAGE YIELD PER RAI BY AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS, AVERAGE HEIGHT OF RICE STALKS SQUARED AND DENSITY OF WEEDS	46
Table 30.	PLANTING METHOD	47
Table 31.	NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED	47
Table 32.	Crosstabulation: NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED BY ETHNIC GROUP	48
Table 33.	Crosstabulation: NUMBER OF TIMES FIELD WEEDED BY PROJECT AREA	49
Table 34.	FIRST WEEDING: DAYS AFTER PLANTING (GROUPED)	50
Table 35.	FIRST WEEDING: DAYS AFTER PLANTING (UNGROUPED)	50
Table 36.	TOOLS USED FOR FIRST WEEDING	50
Table 37.	SECOND WEEDING: DAYS AFTER FIRST WEEDING (GROUPED)	51

Table 38.	SECOND WEEDING: DAYS AFTER FIRST WEEDING (UNGROUPED)	51
Table 39.	TOOLS USED FOR SECOND WEEDING	52
Table 40.	THIRD WEEDING: DAYS AFTER SECOND WEEDING (GROUPED)	52
Table 41.	THRID WEEDING: DAYS AFTER SECOND WEEDING (UNGROUPED)	52
Table 42.	TOOLS USED FOR THIRD WEEDING	53
Table 43.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR FIRST WEEDING BY NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED	53
Table 44.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR SECOND WEEDING BY NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED	54
Table 45.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR THIRD WEEDING BY NUMBER OF YEARS FIELD PLANTED	55
Table 46.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR FIRST WEEDING BY TOOL USED FOR SECOND WEEDING	56
Table 47.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR SECOND WEEDING BY TOOL USED FOR THIRD WEEDING	58
Table 48.	Crosstabulation: TOOL USED FOR FIRST WEEDING BY TOLL USED FOR THIRD WEEDING	57
Table 49.	USE OF FERTILIZER	58
Table 50.	ABILITY/WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE FERTILIZER IF RECEIVE TG-HDP SEED	58
Table 51.	PROBLEMS WITH CROP PESTS	59
Table 52.	NATURE OF CROP PESTS	59
Table 53.	USE OF PESTICIDES	59
Table 54.	FARMERS' ASSESSMENT OF TG-HDP VS. LOCAL VARIETY RICE YIELDS	60
Table 55.	Crosstabulation FARMERS' ASSESSMENT OF TG-HDP VS. LOCAL VARIETY RICE YIELDS BY PROJECT AREA	60
Table 56.	FARMERS' DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE SEED	61
Table 57.	Crosstabulation: FARMERS' DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDSP RICE SEED BY PROJECT AREA	61

Table 58.	REASON DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE VARIETY	62
Table 59.	REASON DO NOT DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE VARIETY	62
Table 60.	Crosstabulation: DESIRE TO EXCHANGE FOR TG-HDP RICE BY DESIRE/ABILITY TO PURCHASE FERTILIZER IF RECEIVE TG-HDP RICE SEED	63

PAYYAP UNIVERSITY

1986 CROP YEAR RICE PRODUCTION SURVEY

During the months of October and November 1986 a team from the Research and Development Center, Payap University, surveyed rice production in the Tambon Wawi and Nam Lang areas of the Thai-German Highland Development Programme. The survey was composed of direct measurement of rice yields supplemented by a questionnaire covering pertinent variables which may affect rice production. Details of the survey activities are as follows.

Farmers were divided into two groups: those who had received training and inputs (including, but not limited to, rice seed) from TG-HDP and those who received neither training nor inputs. In each project area approximately 100 farmers were randomly selected for the survey: 50 who had received training plus TG-HDP inputs and 50 who had received neither for a total of 200 farmers.

The main (largest) rice field cultivated by each farmer selected for survey was identified and measurements were made on that field. In that field, three sub-plots each 25 meters square were chosen to be representative of the different characteristics of the field. The rice in each of the three sub-plots was then harvested and threshed in the field. Thus a total of 75 square meters was harvested per surveyed farmer. The grain was later weighed at the Chiang Mai Fieldcrops Research Center. Weights were corrected to a standard 13% moisture content.

In addition to directly measuring yields, each surveyed farmer was asked a series of questions related to rice production in his fields, e.g., whether he used fertilizer or pesticide, the number of years the field had been planted in succession, etc. Included in the survey questionnaire was a short attitude survey intended to measure villagers' feelings toward TG-HDP rice production improvement activities.

As the survey was not begun until well into the rice harvesting season, many of the farmers had already completed harvesting all their grain. Attempts were made to obtain yield data from villagers who had already harvested their rice. These farmers were queried as to the amount of seed they planted, the total area planted and the total amount of rice harvested in addition to the other survey questions. Unfortunately, the data was not reliable enough to be of significant analytical value. Although this is an unfortunate state of affairs, it does indicate that the trouble and expense of direct measurement of yields is necessary if useful data is to be obtained.

Results of the rice survey are presented in two parts. The first part includes results of surveying farmers who had received rice seed input from TG-HDP and who had received training on rice production from some TG-HDP and/or government agency. The second part includes results of surveying farmers who had received neither training nor inputs from TG-HDP.