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#### Abstract

In this paper an effort has been made to conduct a detailed descriptive study of all the measurable parameters surveyed by Agriculture Department, each year that influence wheat production in the Punjab, Pakistan. A descriptive study of all individuals as well as interaction of various allied variables has been carried out to assess their influence on the production / variation of wheat. For this purpose a data of 25036 cases comprising almost 1.2 million values have been fed and used. Results have been compiled independently on districts, divisions and then on provincial levels to observe the impact of variables on all the levels. The detailed descriptive study of wheat is helpful in the model development for projection of yield and also for making various recommendations to farmers regarding different inputs / parameters of wheat resulting a conversion of a subjective approach about the variables into objective one and ultimately an enhancement in the crop production. Such detailed descriptive study of wheat is an unprecedented effort in the country.
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## INTRODUCTION

Area of Pakistan is 796,096 sq.km and the population is almost 170 million. The country has four provinces namely Sindh, Punjab, Khyber Pakhtoonkawa and Balochistan. The Punjab being the second largest (area of Punjab is 205,345 sq.k.m) and the most agricultural province of the country, contributes almost $75 \%$ to the wheat production of Pakistan. There are two zones of the Punjab: lower and upper. In Kharif season (May to September), rice crop is sown in the upper and cotton is sown in the lower Punjab. Wheat crop is sown in the Rabi season (October to April) throughout the province. There are two major categories of the area in the Punjab: Irrigated and Un-irrigated (Barani). In irrigated area, there is availability of canal as well as tube-well water, so farmers are comparatively less dependent on the rainfalls. But in case of Barani areas, crops are totally dependent on timely rainfalls as there is no availability of
any other source of water. The most of the upper Punjab area is hilly and Barani.
The Punjab is administratively and geographically divided into 113 tehsils, 35 districts and 8 zones (each zone is called a Division). Each division comprises 3 to 6 districts having meteorologically identical state. The name of District-Headquarter of a division is same as the division. A secondary data of wheat production for the year 2005-2006 to 2008-2009 have been taken from the Crop Reporting Service (CRS), an attached wing of Agriculture Department, Government of the Punjab, solely responsible for handling of all kinds of Agricultural Statistics in the Punjab. The total number of selected sample villages is 1086 and in each sample village, six randomly selected plots of $15 \times 20 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ in three randomly selected fields of wheat have been harvested. Yield of each plot along with all the 16 variables, having 43

Table 1. Reliability statistics.

| Divisions | Cronbach's alph (stand) | No. of items | No. of sample points |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lahore | 0.740 | 38 | 2988 |
| Gujranwala | 0.515 | 38 | 4120 |
| Rawalpindi | 0.735 | 37 | 2016 |
| Faislabad | 0.527 | 37 | 2832 |
| Sargodha | 0.540 | 38 | 3090 |
| Multan | 0.546 | 37 | 4794 |
| Bahwalpur | 0.786 | 37 | 2622 |
| D.G.Khan | 0.355 | 38 | 2574 |
| PUNJAB | 0.758 | 38 | 25036 |

categories impacting the yield of the crop, have been recorded. The variables recorded for each field are as follow, Agricultural Statistics of Punjab (2009):
(i) Source of seed: Urea used
(ii) No of Plough: DAP used
(iii) No of Levels: No of waters
(iv) Pesticides used on crop / seed: Total Rainfalls in the season
(v) Spray on crop: Weighted Rainfalls in the season
(vi) Variety of wheat : Average Humidity of the season
(vii) Quantity of seed: Average Max/Min Temperature
(viii) Sowing time: Irrigated/Un-irrigated area

In Pakistan, yield of a crop is measured in 'maund' (1 Maund $=37.3242 \mathrm{~kg}$ ) per 'acre' ( 1 Acre $=198 \times 220$ sq.ft). A total yield data of 25036 plots all over the Punjab amounting to almost 1.2 million values have been used in the study.

## DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF WHEAT IN THE PUNJAB

Each influencing variable on wheat production has some categorical segregation, which has been discussed in detailed in its relevant section. The different dimensions of descriptive study are as follows.

## Reliability analysis

The reliability shows degree of relevance and consistency of measuring instruments (explanatory variables) across time and various items in the instruments with reference to the measure of response variable (Uma, 2009). It is measured in percentage. Table 1 shows reliability statistics of the data on Punjab as well as on all the divisional levels of the province. On Punjab level, the overall reliability of 25036 cases is $75.8 \%$ on account of 38 number of items, which is very good degree of reliability. The degree of reliability varies from division to division, which is the highest in case of Bahawalpur division that is, $78.6 \%$ and minimum against
D.G.Khan division that is, $35.5 \%$, which is due to degree of variation in the regressor variables. Reliability decreases as variation decreases and vice versa. In D.G.Khan division, Rabi season temperature, humidity and rainfalls remain almost consistent in all the concerned districts, that is why it has minimum degree of reliability contrary to the Bahawalpur division having high variation in the regressor variables. The variables having less variation can be removed to increase the degree of reliability.

## Normality analysis

For the most of statistical applications, normality in the data, is pre-requisite (Gujarati, 2003). As the size of the data is sufficiently large that is, it contains 25036 sample points; so graphical checking of normality has been done. Figures 1 and 2 show histograms and P-P plots of wheat production in Punjab and in each division of the province, respectively. All the histograms and P-P plots show that yield of wheat in Punjab, as well as, in each divisional level is almost normally distributed as depicted in the Figures 1 and 2 , that is, there is no issue of abnormality of response variable in the data.

Histogram and P-P plot of Rawalpindi division show a little bit deviation from normality, as compared to the other divisions because the division comprises four districts, Rawalpindi, Attock, Jhelum and Chakwal, of which only one district Chakwal is irrigated and others three are totally un-irrigated. There is a massive difference between the production of irrigated and unirrigated areas, that is why the yield of the division is not normal. But on the whole Punjab level both histogram and P-P plot show normality in the data, which accommodates the minor abnormality of Rawalpindi division.

## Basic statistics of wheat in the Punjab

The Punjab as well as eight divisional basic statistics of wheat is given in Table 2. Multan division is on the top


Figure 1. Histograms of wheat production.


Figure 2. P-P plots of wheat production.

Table 2. Yield of wheat in Punjab.

| Provincial / divisional yield of wheat in Punjab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divisions | No. of sample points | Average yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V $(\%)$ | Min. yield $(\mathbf{m})$ | Max. yield (m) | Skew |
| Lahore | 2988 | 33.99 | 10.84 | 32 | 0.78 | 76.32 | -0.092 |
| Gujranwala | 4120 | 29.86 | 10.78 | 36 | 0.08 | 63.60 | -0.275 |
| Rawalpindi | 2016 | 18.42 | 9.36 | 51 | 0.18 | 57.49 | 0.940 |
| Faislabad | 2832 | 33.08 | 10.46 | 32 | 0.39 | 70.21 | -0.037 |
| Sargodha | 3090 | 25.57 | 10.23 | 40 | 0.53 | 65.16 | 0.066 |
| Multan | 4794 | 34.15 | 10.62 | 31 | 0.39 | 71.58 | -0.035 |
| Bahawalpur | 2622 | 31.44 | 10.43 | 33 | 0.68 | 63.69 | -0.070 |
| D.G.Khan | 2574 | 29.98 | 10.19 | 34 | 0.89 | 75.35 | 0.163 |
| PUNJAB | 25036 | 30.27 | 11.35 | 37 | 0.08 | 76.32 | -0.029 |

with $34.15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ yield and Rawalpindi division is at the bottom with $18.42 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ as it is an un-irrigated area. Rawalpindi division has shown the most variant production where as Multan division is production wise maximum consistent, as it has minimum $31 \%$ variation in yield. Overall variation in wheat production in the Punjab is $37 \%$. The highest production of the province comes from Lahore that is, $76.32 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$, where as the least production is from Gujranwala division that is, $3 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ac}$. Overall on the province level, skewness of production is 0.029 , which depicts almost a normal trend (Montgomery, 2001). Except one division, Rawalpindi, all the divisions show normality in production of wheat. Values of skewness on provincial and divisional levels also support the normality issues discussed above.

## Production of irrigated and un-irrigated areas

As it has been discussed that there are two major classifications of Punjab areas: irrigated and un-irrigated. Because both have significant difference of production of wheat so they have been independently described. Table 3 shows, $90 \%$ of the province area is irrigated because of availability of canal water (Pakistan has the largest network of canal system in the world), tube-well, well and other sources of water, where as only $10 \%$ of total area, mostly upper Punjab comprising Rawalpindi division and a little part of Gujranwala and Sargodha divisions, is unirrigated. As it is shown in Table 3, average production of irrigated area is $93 \%$ more than the average production of un-irrigated area. Also production of irrigated area is more consistent to un-irrigated area, that is $33 \%$ as compared to $53 \%$ respectively. On divisional level, irrigated area of Sargodha division has $165 \%$ more average yield of wheat as compared to average yield of its un-irrigated area.

## Source of seed and wheat production

In the Punjab, there are two types of source of seeds;
one of them is own home seed and second one is the certified seed. Along the private sector, one public sector organization, Punjab Seed Corporation (PSC) is responsible for the provision of certified seed of all the crops to the farmers of the province (Table 4). As shown in Table 4, $83 \%$ farmers use own home seed and 17\% use certified seed. In most of the agricultural countries, proportion of usage of certified seed is not more than $30 \%$. The average yield of wheat using certified seed is $11 \%$ more than the other category and also more consistent as compared to own home seed that is, $35 \%$ as compared to $38 \%$ variation in the yield, respectively. The maximum usage of certified seed is in Multan that is, $27 \%$ and maximum impact on yield is in Rawalpindi division that is, $24 \%$ more yield as compared to home seed. It indicates that impact of certified seed on yield in un-irrigated area is more than that of irrigated one.

## Wheat variety comparison

Various varieties of wheat are sown in the Punjab like Inqlab-91 (with reference to the year when it was introduced), Pervaaz, Sehair, Miraj-08, Lasani-08, Faislabad-08 and Chakwal-50 etc. But, as shown in Table 5, 52\% of farmers use Inglab-91 and rest of 48\% use other varieties. Overall on the Punjab level, average yield of wheat of other varieties is $12 \%$ more than Inqlab91 and also yield wise other varieties are more consistent that is, $36 \%$ as compared to $39 \%$ variation. On divisional level comparison, in Rawalpindi division, average yield of other varieties is only 4\% more than Inqlab-91, which is minimum in the Punjab. Hence it can be concluded that in Barani area Inqlab-91 variety and others have almost same production level of wheat. On upper Punjab level like Lahore and Gujranwala divisions, the average yield of other varieties is 14 and $24 \%$ more than Inqlab-91, respectively. But on lower Punjab level like DGKhan division, the impact of other varieties on average yield is merely 5\% more than Inqlab-91.

Table 3. Irrigation mode.

| Irrigation mode |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divisions | Irrigated |  |  |  |  | Unirrigated |  |  |  |  | Impact on yield (\%) |
|  | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) |  |
| Lahore | 2988 | 100 | 33.99 | 10.84 | 32 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gujranwala | 3756 | 91 | 31.10 | 10.02 | 32 | 364 | 9 | 17.00 | 9.86 | 58 | +82 |
| Rawalpindi | 184 | 9 | 30.12 | 9.55 | 32 | 1832 | 91 | 17.25 | 8.50 | 49 | +75 |
| Faislabad | 2832 | 100 | 33.08 | 10.46 | 32 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sargodha | 2698 | 87 | 27.77 | 8.89 | 32 | 392 | 13 | 10.46 | 4.38 | 42 | +165 |
| Multan | 4794 | 100 | 34.15 | 10.62 | 31 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bahawalpur | 2622 | 100 | 31.44 | 10.43 | 33 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| D.G.Khan | 2562 | 99 | 30.04 | 10.16 | 34 | 12 | 1 | 16.83 | 5.13 | 30 | +78 |
| PUNJAB | 22436 | 90 | 31.90 | 10.46 | 33 | 2600 | 10 | 16.19 | 8.56 | 53 | +93 |

Table 4. Source of seed.

| Source of Seed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divisions | Own home |  |  |  |  | Certified |  |  |  |  | Impact on yield (\%) |
|  | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) |  |
| Lahore | 2554 | 85 | 33.25 | 10.41 | 31 | 434 | 15 | 38.38 | 12.18 | 32 | +15 |
| Gujranwala | 3904 | 95 | 29.59 | 10.73 | 36 | 216 | 5 | 34.74 | 10.39 | 30 | +17 |
| Faislabad | 2440 | 86 | 32.57 | 10.29 | 32 | 392 | 14 | 36.25 | 10.98 | 30 | +11 |
| Rawalpindi | 1634 | 81 | 17.61 | 9.17 | 52 | 382 | 19 | 21.90 | 9.39 | 43 | +24 |
| Sargodha | 2765 | 89 | 25.16 | 10.27 | 41 | 325 | 11 | 29.09 | 9.19 | 32 | +16 |
| Multan | 3522 | 73 | 33.50 | 10.51 | 31 | 1272 | 27 | 35.93 | 10.70 | 30 | +7 |
| Bahawalpur | 2046 | 78 | 31.33 | 10.46 | 33 | 576 | 22 | 31.87 | 10.33 | 32 | +2 |
| D.G.Khan | 1929 | 75 | 29.61 | 10.01 | 34 | 645 | 25 | 31.07 | 10.65 | 34 | +5 |
| PUNJAB | 20794 | 83 | 29.70 | 11.23 | 38 | 4242 | 17 | 33.07 | 11.48 | 35 | +11 |

## Sowing time and wheat production

Sowing time plays a key role with reference to the yield of wheat. The sowing of wheat is started in Punjab with the start of Rabi season in October and is continued till the end of December. Total
sowing time has been broken up in to five periods as shown in Table 6. Only 7\% farmers in the Punjab sow the crop up to $31^{\text {st }}$ of October and get an average yield of $22.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$, which is least in all the five periods with $57 \%$ variation in the yield, which is the highest one. The reason of the lowest
average and the highest variation is due to $48 \%$ sowing of wheat in un-irrigated area of Punjab that is, Rawalpindi division. Analyzing divisional level results in the first period of sowing, it is evident that the sowing of wheat in irrigated area is just 1 to $4 \%$ in this specific period because during Kharif

Table 5. Wheat variety analysis.

| Wheat variety comparision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divisions | In q Iab-91 |  |  |  |  | Others |  |  |  |  | Impact on yield (\%) |
|  | Sample points | \%age share | Avg. yield (m/ac) | S. $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | C.V (\%) | Sample points | \%age share | Avg. yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) |  |
| Lahore | 1864 | 62 | 32.29 | 10.17 | 31 | 1124 | 38 | 36.82 | 11.31 | 31 | +14 |
| Gujranwala | 3314 | 80 | 28.54 | 10.55 | 37 | 806 | 20 | 35.30 | 9.94 | 28 | +24 |
| Rawalpindi | 1314 | 65 | 18.17 | 9.25 | 51 | 702 | 35 | 18.89 | 9.56 | 51 | +4 |
| Faislabad | 1228 | 43 | 32.11 | 9.88 | 31 | 1604 | 57 | 33.83 | 10.82 | 32 | +5 |
| Sargodha | 1425 | 46 | 24.95 | 10.37 | 42 | 1665 | 54 | 26.11 | 10.08 | 39 | +5 |
| Multan | 2102 | 44 | 32.04 | 10.14 | 32 | 2692 | 56 | 35.79 | 10.69 | 30 | +12 |
| Bahawalpur | 785 | 30 | 29.36 | 11.19 | 38 | 1837 | 70 | 32.33 | 10.27 | 32 | +10 |
| D.G.Khan | 955 | 37 | 29.05 | 10.02 | 34 | 1619 | 63 | 30.53 | 10.06 | 33 | +5 |
| PUNJAB | 12987 | 52 | 28.62 | 11.03 | 39 | 12049 | 48 | 32.04 | 11.41 | 36 | +12 |

season harvesting of rice paddy in upper Punjab and picking of cotton in lower Punjab irrigated areas are not completed up to $31^{\text {st }}$ October. Otherwise average yield of wheat of irrigated areas in this period would have been significantly high.Maximum sowing of the crop on Punjab level takes place during the second half of November, that is, $38 \%$ of total sowing. But maximum yield is achieved against the sowing of the crop in the first half of November that is, $31.85 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$. But average yield against the sowing of wheat in second half of November is almost same that is, $31.37 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with minimum variation of $34 \%$. So for the sowing of wheat, month of November is the best one, which is quite in accordance with the instructions given to the farmers by the Agriculture Department, Punjab regarding the wheat-sowing period. It can also be observed that as the sowing time is delayed, average yield gradually goes down. It is indicated from the last sowing period of the divisional results that sowing in the rice growing areas (upper Punjab) is almost over but in the cotton growing areas (lower Punjab), 13 to 18\% sowing takes place in this period as picking of
cotton remains continued till the end of December and January.

## Usage of seed quantity

Production of wheat is also influenced by the quantity of seed used per acre. There are certain categories of quantity of seed per acre that is used by $95 \%$ farmers of the Punjab as shown in the Table 7. It is given that as the quantity of seed per acre increases, the average yield gradually increases and the maximum yield that is, 31.98 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{ac}$ is obtained against $60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ac}$ quantities of seed on the Punjab level. As the quantity of seed increases from $60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ac}$, the average yield gradually decreases.

Maximum $46 \%$ farmers of the province use 50 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ac}$ seed quantity. It is also shown that $69 \%$ farmers of Rawalpindi division use seed quantity equal or less than $40 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ac}$, as it is an un-irrigated area. Also in the lower Punjab area like Multan, Bahawalpur and D.G. Khan divisions, only less than $3 \%$ farmers use 40 kg or below quantity of
seed as the sowing time of the crop is mostly delayed because of late picking of cotton. As the sowing time is delayed, the quantity of seed has to be increased to get better yield. In upper Punjab area, rice paddy is harvested comparatively early than cotton, so there is no usage of more than $60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ac}$ seed quantity of wheat in the rice growing zone.

## Sowing time and seed quantity

In the Table 8, the impact of sowing time over the quantity of seed per acre has been observed. The results given in Table 8 show that as the sowing time is delayed, the quantity of seed per acre has to be increased to sustain the production level. Maximum $21 \%$ farmers in irrigated and $31 \%$ farmers in un-irrigated area use 50 kg seed and 40 kg seed against the sowing of the crop in the second half of November and at the end of October, respectively. Maximum average yield $35.1 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with $30 \%$ variation is obtained in irrigated area against sowing in the first of

Table 6. Sowing time analysis.

| Sowing time and wheat yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sowing periods | Items | Divisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PUNJAB |
|  |  | Lahore | G_wala | F_abad | R_pindi | Sargodha | Multan | B_pur | DGKhan |  |
| Up to 31st October | Sample points | 116 | 154 | 83 | 962 | 366 | 68 | 21 | 46 | 1816 |
|  | \%age Share | 4 | 4 | 3 | 48 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 36.84 | 30.33 | 36.93 | 18.28 | 16.25 | 34.82 | 39.84 | 26.06 | 22.00 |
|  | S.D (m) | 11.10 | 12.23 | 13.46 | 8.98 | 10.30 | 14.16 | 10.19 | 12.80 | 12.63 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 30 | 40 | 36 | 49 | 63 | 41 | 26 | 49 | 57 |
| From Nov 1 to Nov 15 | Sample points | 815 | 1358 | 1082 | 780 | 1418 | 1228 | 564 | 718 | 7963 |
|  | \%age Share | 27 | 33 | 38 | 39 | 46 | 26 | 22 | 28 | 32 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 37.43 | 31.70 | 34.88 | 19.54 | 26.83 | 38.02 | 35.64 | 30.98 | 31.85 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.32 | 10.82 | 10.50 | 9.90 | 9.62 | 10.98 | 9.83 | 9.94 | 11.71 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 28 | 34 | 30 | 51 | 36 | 29 | 28 | 32 | 37 |
| From Nov 16 to Nov 30 | Sample points | 1575 | 2145 | 916 | 220 | 955 | 1880 | 975 | 756 | 9422 |
|  | \%age Share | 53 | 52 | 32 | 11 | 31 | 39 | 37 | 29 | 38 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 32.80 | 29.66 | 33.42 | 15.42 | 27.26 | 34.81 | 32.74 | 30.27 | 31.37 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.82 | 10.32 | 10.40 | 8.44 | 9.29 | 10.11 | 9.71 | 10.90 | 10.78 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 33 | 35 | 31 | 55 | 34 | 29 | 30 | 36 | 34 |
| From Dec 1 to Dec 15 | Sample points | 362 | 353 | 527 | 32 | 241 | 1010 | 688 | 596 | 3809 |
|  | \%age Share | 12 | 9 | 19 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 26 | 23 | 15 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 30.73 | 26.63 | 30.86 | 14.18 | 25.85 | 32.17 | 29.05 | 30.28 | 29.93 |
|  | S.D (m) | 9.97 | 9.95 | 9.10 | 6.89 | 9.42 | 9.29 | 10.25 | 9.81 | 9.93 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 32 | 37 | 29 | 49 | 36 | 29 | 35 | 32 | 33 |
| From Dec 16 and later | Sample points | 120 | 110 | 224 | 22 | 110 | 608 | 374 | 458 | 2026 |
|  | \%age Share | 4 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 8 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 33.42 | 20.69 | 26.85 | 21.20 | 25.15 | 27.49 | 25.65 | 27.93 | 26.97 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.48 | 11.90 | 8.69 | 9.69 | 10.81 | 9.03 | 9.73 | 9.18 | 9.81 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 31 | 58 | 32 | 46 | 43 | 33 | 38 | 33 | 36 |

November and seed quantity 60 kg per acre whereas in un-irrigated area, the highest average
yield $17.50 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with $52 \%$ variation is against first half of November and 50 kg seed per acre. It is
worthy to highlight that in the whole province, seed quantity and sowing time are almost equally
distributed that is, there is no congestion in a particular cell of Table 8 . For early sowing that is, up to $31^{\text {st }}$ October 40 kg seed quantity produces the maximum yield of $31.30 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ in irrigated area. For this particular period, increase in seed quantity causes the reduction in the yield. It is important to point out that for a particular seed quantity, especially in un-irrigated area, the yield is gradually increased as the sowing period is delayed.

## Application of fertilizers

Table 9 shows an impact of combination of two types of fertilizers: Urea and DAP (Di Ammonia Phosphate) on the yield of wheat taking their different pairs of quantities. As the fertilizers have different impact on the crop of irrigated and un-irrigated areas, so they have been individually analyzed. As there is no application of urea fertilizer more than 100 kg per acre in un-irrigated area, therefore columns of un-irrigated area against 125, 150 and 200 kg urea have been omitted from Table 10 for simplification purpose. There are maximum $46 \%$ cases in un-irrigated area, where no fertilizer has been used and resultantly there is only an average yield of $12.90 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a high variation of $52 \%$ in the yield. The second highest share in un-irrigated area is $14 \%$ against a combination of 50 kg fertilizer of each type in an acre getting an average yield of $22.10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $43 \%$ in yield. The maximum average yield in un-irrigated area is $29.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $37 \%$ against a combination of no DAP and 100 kg urea per acre, but combination of this fertilizers share is just $0.5 \%$ in the whole data of unirrigated area, which is quite negligible.
In irrigated area, maximum 34\% farmers use a combination of 50 kg fertilizer of each type giving an average yield of $30.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with $31 \%$ variation. The second highest combination $28 \%$ of fertilizers in irrigated area is 50 kg DAP and 100 kg urea per acre yielding an average production of $34.1 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $29 \%$. The maximum average yield $40.4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $26 \%$ is produced against a combination 125 kg urea and 100 kg DAP in irrigated area with a minor share of $0.1 \%$. The highest inconsistent yield in un-irrigated area is 14.3 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $55 \%$ against a combination of no DAP and 25 kg urea. In case of irrigated area, the most variant yield is $21.7 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $58 \%$ against usage of neither fertilizer.

## Pesticides / Weedicides spray

A spray of pesticides / weedicides is extremely important for a good production of wheat. Table 10 shows an overall impact of pesticides on the crop. On the whole, $41 \%$ of farmers of the Punjab use pesticides spray on the crop and get $27 \%$ more yield as compared to the crop, which has not been sprayed. Also yield of sprayed crop is
more consistent than the yield of unsprayed crop that is, $28 \%$ as compared to $42 \%$ variation in the yield. Individually on divisional level analysis, the maximum impact of pesticides spray is in Rawalpindi division that is, $62 \%$ more production as compared to unsprayed crop. Hence it can be concluded that pesticides positive impact considerably more incun-irrigated area as compared to irrigated one. But only 5\% farmers in Rawalpindi division use pesticides spray on their wheat crop because of being barani area. The maximum usage of pesticides is in Lahore, Gujranwala and Multan divisions that is, 52,48 and $49 \%$, respectively Usage of pesticides is also an indicator of financial status of farmers of that particular area, as pesticides are comparatively much expensive items in the crop inputs.

## Pesticides spray on a diseased crop

Table 11 is an elaborated form of Table 10. Pesticides are sprayed because of some diseases to the crop or for harmful weeds and may be for both of the reasons. Four categories have been designed to analyze the impact of pesticides spray on different status of the crop: No Diseases + No Spray, No Diseases + Spray, Diseases + No Spray and Diseases + Spray. Maximum average yield $34.67 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with only $29 \%$ variation is against the category No Disease + Spray that is, spray for weeds on the diseases less crop and $36 \%$ farmers fall in this category. Minimum average yield $27.31 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ in maximum $56 \%$ number of cases with highest $42 \%$ variation is in the category of No Diseases + No Spray. Analyzing divisional level results, the maximum yield in all the categories is obtained in Multan division that is, 36.97 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with a variation of $28 \%$ in the production is in the category of No Diseases + Spray. The minimum yield of wheat $26.90 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with high $39 \%$ variation on Punjab level, is against the category Diseases + No Spray. All the results are logically true and also match with the ground realities.

## Ploughing / leveling and wheat production

Table 12 shows various combination of ploughing and leveling in the province. A proper combination of suitable number of plough and level, subject to the availability of water, humidity level and nature of soil causes a good production of wheat. Minimum number of level in the Punjab is 1 and maximum 6 and minimum number of plough is 1 and maximum is 8 . In this way, there are 48 combinations of level and plough. Each combination has been individually analyzed for irrigated and un-irrigated areas. In irrigated and un-irrigated areas, maximum 25 and $13 \%$ farmers use a combination of 2 levels and 4 ploughs getting an average yield of 31.0 and $14.4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with 33 and $42 \%$ variation in the yield, respectively.

Table 7. Use of seed quantity.

| Quantity seed used per acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seed quantity (kg) | Items | Divisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PUNJAB |
|  |  | Lahore | G_wala | F_abad | R_pindi | Sargodha | Multan | B_pur | DGKhan |  |
| Qty $<=40$ | Sample points | 583 | 1333 | - | 1386 | 462 | 122 | 42 | 32 | 4230 |
|  | \%age Share | 20 | 32 | - | 69 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 17 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 31.29 | 26.65 | - | 17.58 | 15.93 | 33.48 | 27.46 | 27.46 | 23.58 |
|  | S.D (m) | 11.37 | 11.10 | - | 8.58 | 8.90 | 12.67 | 9.79 | 11.55 | 11.83 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 36 | 42 | - | 49 | 56 | 38 | 36 | 42 | 50 |
| Qty $=45$ | Sample points | 366 | 824 | 222 | 232 | 226 | 118 | 66 | 20 | 2074 |
|  | \%age Share | 12 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 32.03 | 33.43 | 32.72 | 16.90 | 21.20 | 36.94 | 30.17 | 29.12 | 29.98 |
|  | S.D (m) | 9.49 | 10.16 | 11.42 | 8.81 | 9.87 | 10.68 | 10.61 | 11.56 | 11.74 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 30 | 30 | 35 | 52 | 47 | 29 | 35 | 40 | 39 |
| Qty $=50$ | Sample points | 1957 | 1865 | 1650 | 356 | 1526 | 2263 | 1104 | 799 | 11520 |
|  | \%age Share | 65 | 45 | 58 | 18 | 49 | 47 | 42 | 31 | 46 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 34.91 | 30.68 | 33.02 | 22.14 | 27.58 | 34.83 | 31.35 | 28.58 | 31.79 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.60 | 10.16 | 10.44 | 11.22 | 9.69 | 11.23 | 10.43 | 9.47 | 10.91 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 30 | 33 | 32 | 51 | 35 | 32 | 33 | 33 | 34 |
| Qty = 60 | Sample points | 78 | 96 | $654$ | $42$ | $726$ | $1735$ | $1076$ | 905 | $5312$ |
|  | \%age Share | $3$ | 2 | 23 | 2 | 23 | 36 | 41 | $35$ | $21$ |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | 40.14 | 27.88 | 34.57 | 23.35 | 28.49 | 33.89 | 31.80 | 29.58 | 31.98 |
|  | $\mathrm{S} . \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{~m})$ | $12.74$ | 10.74 | 9.26 | 10.52 | 8.35 | 9.60 | 10.62 | 10.34 | $10.15$ |
|  | C.V (\%) | 32 | 39 | 27 | 45 | 29 | 28 | 33 | 35 | 32 |
| Qty $=70$ | Sample points | - | - | 24 | - | 142 | 384 | 218 | 464 | 1238 |
|  | \%age Share | - | - | 1 | - | 5 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 5 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | - | - | 34.00 | - | 27.31 | 31.84 | 32.86 | 32.19 | 31.69 |
|  | S.D (m) | - | - | 10.56 | - | 8.53 | 10.20 | 9.90 | 11.03 | 10.41 |
|  | C.V (\%) | - | - | 31 | - | 31 | 32 | 30 | 34 | 33 |
| Qty> $=80$ | Sample points | - | - | - | - | - | 146 | 98 | 328 | 584 |
|  | \%age Share | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 4 | 13 | 2 |
|  | Avg yield (m/ac) | - | - | - | - | - | 30.60 | 28.22 | 31.33 | 30.59 |
|  | S.D (m) | - | - | - | - | - | 9.74 | 9.15 | 9.44 | 9.45 |
|  | C.V (\%) | - | - | - | - | - | 32 | 32 | 30 | 31 |

Table 8. The sowing time and seed quantity per acre.

| Sowing time and seed quantity used per acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seed quantity (Kg) | Items | Sowing time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Up to Oct |  | Nov 1-15 |  | Nov 16-30 |  | Dec 1-15 |  | Dec16 later |  |
|  |  | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un |
| $=<40$ | S.Pnts | 98 | 806 | 864 | 722 | 1075 | 274 | 267 | 34 | 74 | 16 |
|  | \%age | 0.4 | 31 | 3.9 | 28 | 4.8 | 11 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 1 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 31.3 | 16.4 | 31.1 | 16.4 | 28.9 | 15.1 | 25.8 | 11.7 | 26.8 | 13.9 |
|  | SD (m) | 12.4 | 8.2 | 10.7 | 8.5 | 10.4 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 6.3 | 11.9 | 10.7 |
|  | C.V(\%) | 40 | $50$ | 34 | $52$ | 36 | 57 | 41 | 54 | 44 | 77 |
| $=45$ | S.Pnts | 69 | 130 | 604 | 96 | 800 | 32 | 149 | - | 62 | - |
|  | \%age | 0.3 | 5 | 2.7 | 4 | 3.6 | 1 | 0.7 | - | 0.3 | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 32.4 | 15.4 | 35.0 | 15.9 | 32.1 | 14.7 | 28.7 | - | 24.3 | - |
|  | SD (m) | 11.6 | 8.3 | 9.7 | 7.9 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 10.3 | - | 10.7 | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | 36 | 54 | 28 | 50 | 31 | 52 | 36 | - | 44 | - |
| $=50$ | S.Pnts | 309 | 122 | 3886 | 64 | 4753 | 54 | 1518 | - | 574 | 14 |
|  | \%age | 1.4 | 5 | 17.3 | 2 | 21.2 | 2 | 6.8 | - | 2.6 | 1 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 33.3 | 15.8 | 34.3 | 17.5 | 32.2 | 16.7 | 29.7 | - | 26.4 | 9.7 |
|  | SD (m) | 12.5 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.8 | - | 9.7 | 8.2 |
|  | C.V(\%) | 38 | 53 | 31 | 52 | 32 | 61 | 33 | - | 37 | 85 |
| $=60$ | S.Pnts | 100 | - | 1039 | - | 1502 | - | 1131 | - | 618 | - |
|  | \%age | 0.4 | - | 4.6 | - | 6.7 | - | 5.0 | - | 2.8 | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 31.9 | - | 35.1 | - | 33.4 | - | 30.9 | - | 27.7 | - |
|  | SD (m) | 12.9 | - | 10.5 | - | 9.8 | - | 9.4 | - | 9.4 | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | 40 | - | 30 | - | 29 | - | 30 | - | 34 | - |
| $=70$ |  | $20$ | - | $120$ |  | $270$ | - | $262$ | - | $246$ | - |
|  | \%age | $0.1$ | - | $0.5$ | - | $1.2$ | - | $1.2$ | - | 1.1 | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 32.9 | - | 35.1 | - | 33.1 |  | 32.8 | - | 28.3 | - |
|  | SD (m) | $9.2$ | - | $11.9$ | - | $10.7$ | - | $9.0$ | - | 9.5 | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | 28 | - | 34 | - | 32 | - | 27 | - | 34 |  |
| $=>80$ |  | $12$ |  | $26$ |  | $104$ | - | $178$ | - | $264$ | - |
|  | \%age | $0.1$ | - | $0.1$ | - | $0.5$ | - | $0.8$ |  | 1.2 | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | $37.4$ | - | 34.8 | - | 33.4 | - | 32.2 | - | 27.7 | - |
|  | SD (m) | $10.0$ | - | $8.3$ |  | $9.9$ |  | $9.4$ | - | $8.5$ | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | 27 | - | 24 | - | 30 | - | 29 | - | 31 | - |

Table 9. Use of fertilizers.

| Usage of fertilizers and wheat yield in Punjab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fertilizer name |  |  | Urea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qty (Kg) |  |  | 0 |  | 25 |  | 50 |  | 75 |  | 100 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 125 \\ & \hline \text { Irri } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 150 \\ & \hline \text { Irri } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 200 \\ & \hline \text { Irri } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | S.Pnts | 230 | 1204 | 48 | 46 | 1397 | 212 | 134 | - | 688 | 12 | 18 | 102 | 16 |
|  |  | \%age | 1 | 46 | 0.2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 0.6 | - | 3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Avg (m/ac) | 21.7 | 12.9 | 19.8 | 14.3 | 24.3 | 17.4 | 27.7 | - | 29.4 | 29.2 | 28.5 | 30.9 | 28.7 |
|  |  | SD (m) | 12.6 | 6.7 | 10.5 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 7.6 | 9.6 | - | 10.8 | 10.8 | 13.7 | 9.2 | 11.9 |
|  |  | C.V(\%) | 58 | 52 | 53 | 55 | 41 | 44 | 34 | - | 37 | 37 | 48 | 30 | 41 |
| D |  | S.Pnts | 16 | 73 | 80 | 151 | 254 | 14 | 76 | - | 104 | - | 14 | - | - |
|  |  | \%age | 0.1 | 3 | 0.4 | 6 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.1 | - | - |
|  | 25 | Avg (m/ac) | 11.9 | 15.5 | 24.9 | 19.5 | 26.5 | 21.7 | 27.4 | - | 30.7 | - | 31.1 | - | - |
| A |  | SD (m) | 5.7 | 6.2 | 11.7 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 8.8 | - | 10.9 | - | 12.3 | - | - |
|  |  | C.V(\%) | 48 | 40 | 47 | 52 | 39 | 44 | 32 | - | 36 | - | 39 | - | - |
|  | 50 | S.Pnts | 121 | 187 | 74 | 92 | 7562 | 370 | 1248 | - | 6320 | 8 | 226 | 850 | 58 |
| P |  | \%age | 1 | 7 | 0.3 | 4 | 34 | 14 | 6 | - | 28 | 0.3 | 1 | 4 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Avg (m/ac) | 23.8 | 17.4 | 30.9 | 21.1 | 30.2 | 22.1 | 33.6 | - | 34.1 | 14.4 | 36.5 | 36.2 | 37.2 |
|  |  | SD (m) | 10.8 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 8.4 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 9.2 | - | 10.0 | 3.2 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 11.4 |
|  |  | C.V(\%) | 45 | 43 | 30 | 40 | 31 | 43 | 27 | - | 29 | 22 | 30 | 28 | 31 |
| 75 |  | S.Pnts | - | - | - | - | 122 | - | 163 | - | 499 | - | 40 | 82 | - |
|  |  | \%age | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | 0.2 | 0.4 | - |
|  |  | Avg (m/ac) | - | - | - |  | 35.2 | - | 35.4 | - | 37.8 | - | 40.3 | 35.6 | - |
|  |  | SD (m) | - | - | - | - | 8.8 | - | 7.7 | - | 8.9 | - | 11.3 | 10.9 | - |
|  |  | C.V(\%) | - | - | - | - | 25 | - | 22 | - | 23 | - | 28 | 31 | - |
| 100 |  | S.Pnts | 16 | - | - | - | 282 | - | 84 | - | 698 | - | 28 | 173 | 38 |
|  |  | \%age | 0.1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 0.4 | - | 3 | - | 0.1 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  |  | Avg (m/ac) | 34.6 | - | - | - | 35.0 | - | 40.2 | - | 37.2 | - | 40.4 | 38.2 | 36.1 |
|  |  | SD (m) | 11.6 | - | - | - | 9.3 | - | 13.1 | - | 10.2 | - | 10.7 | 9.1 | 7.4 |
|  |  | C.V(\%) | 34 | - | - | - | 27 | - | 33 | - | 27 | - | 26 | 24 | 20 |

The maximum yield in case of irrigated area is 36.9 m/ac with a variation of $32 \%$ against a
combination of 6 levels and 4 ploughs, where as in case of un-irrigated area, the maximum yield is
26.5 m/ac with $28 \%$ variation against 6 levels and 5 ploughs. It is a general trend, which can be

Table 10. Pesticides spray.

| Pesticides spray on wheat crop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |  | Impact on yield (\%) Inc |
| Divisions | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S.D } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C.V } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Sample points | \%age share | Avg yield (m/ac) | S.D (m) | C.V (\%) |  |
| Lahore | 1558 | 52 | 36.31 | 9.98 | 27 | 1430 | 48 | 31.51 | 11.17 | 35 | 15 |
| Gujranwala | 1970 | 48 | 33.56 | 9.20 | 27 | 2150 | 52 | 26.46 | 10.99 | 42 | 27 |
| Faislabad | 1272 | 45 | 36.45 | 9.41 | 26 | 1560 | 55 | 30.34 | 10.48 | 35 | 20 |
| Rawalpindi | 100 | 5 | 29.04 | 9.78 | 34 | 1916 | 95 | 17.87 | 9.01 | 50 | 62 |
| Sargodha | 970 | 31 | 30.06 | 8.54 | 28 | 2120 | 69 | 23.52 | 10.28 | 44 | 28 |
| Multan | 2354 | 49 | 36.47 | 10.43 | 29 | 2440 | 51 | 31.90 | 10.30 | 32 | 14 |
| Bahawalpur | 892 | 34 | 34.62 | 9.47 | 27 | 1730 | 66 | 29.81 | 10.53 | 35 | 16 |
| D.G.Khan | 1096 | 43 | 32.42 | 9.20 | 28 | 1478 | 57 | 28.18 | 10.51 | 37 | 15 |
| P U NJAB | 10212 | 41 | 34.61 | 9.85 | 28 | 14824 | 59 | 27.28 | 11.34 | 42 | 27 |

observed in Table 12 that as numbers of level and plough increase, the average yield also increases.

## Number of water used to wheat crop

In irrigated area of the Punjab, number of water is very important for the yield of wheat. Becauseof availability of timely rainfalls, number of waters can be increased or decreased accordingly. The data has been segregated in to six categories on the basis of number of water from one to six and above as shown in Table 13. It is generally observed from Table 13 that as number of water is increased, average yield is also increased and after 4-number of waters, it comes down. Against 4-number of water, maximum yield 33.26 m/acwith a variation of $31 \%$ is obtained. Maximum $33 \%$ farmers of irrigated area of the Punjab use 4number of waters. In Sargodha division 28\% farmers use 4-number of water getting average yield of $28.57 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ac}$ with $31 \%$ variation and $24 \%$ farmers use 6 and more number of waters getting
27.77 m/ac yield with a variation of $27 \%$ in the yield. The maximum use of number of water that is, six or more is the highest in Punjab that is $24 \%$ because the nature of soil in Sargodha division is sandy, especially in district Bhakhar. As the ground absorbs water rapidly so farmers have to increase the number of water to maintain the germination pace of the crop. It is also notable that as the number of water increased, the variation in the yield gradually decreased. It is important to highlight that in the upper Punjab, less number of water is used as compared to lower / central Punjab irrigated area like Bahawalpur, D.G.Khan and Sargodha divisions, 8 to $24 \%$ farmers use 6 or more water where as in upper Punjab, Lahore and Faislabad divisions only 2 to $4 \%$ farmers use 6 or more number of water. Particularly in Gujranwala division, no one uses 6 or more number of water.

## Number of water and amount of rainfalls

With reference to Tables 15 and 16, Table 14 also
shows the application of weighted rainfalls methodology. According to the Punjab climate, 3 waters are essential to wheat crop throughout the Rabi season. In irrigated area farmers are comparatively less dependent upon rainfalls as they have other sources of watering. However number of water is totally dependent on the timely rainfalls. In case of timely rainfalls, cost of watering is saved and the crop receives rather better natural water. But in case of no, less or out time rainfalls, farmers have to increase the number of water to keep the crop germination momentum. It indicates an existence of association between number of water and amounts of rainfalls. Two methods have been used to find out the average number of water in all the districts of Punjab: mean and mode. Similarly, two methods of association between number of water and amounts of actual / weighted rainfalls have been used: Simple and Rank correlations. Table 14 shows that both simple and rank coefficients of correlation are higher between weighted rainfalls and number of water as

Table 11. Crop diseases and pesticides spray.

| Diseased crop and pestcides spray |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disease and spray | Items | Divisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PUNJAB |
|  |  | Lahore | G_wala | F_abad | R_pindi | Sargodha | Multan | B_pur | DGKhan |  |
| No disease + No spray | Sample points | 1198 | 2006 | 1438 | 1862 | 2072 | 2228 | 1678 | 1434 | 13916 |
|  | \%age Share | 40 | 49 | 51 | 92 | 67 | 46 | 64 | 56 | 56 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 32.24 | 26.69 | 30.47 | 17.91 | 23.51 | 32.12 | 29.79 | 28.16 | 27.31 |
|  | S.D (m) | 11.11 | 11.01 | 10.57 | 8.97 | 10.30 | 10.28 | 10.62 | 10.54 | 11.40 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 34 | 41 | 35 | 50 | 44 | 32 | 36 | 37 | 42 |
| No disease + spray (for weeds) | Sample points | 1234 | 1784 | 1110 | 98 | 946 | 1887 | 868 | 1050 | 8977 |
|  | \%age Share | 41 | 43 | 39 | 5 | 31 | 39 | 33 | 41 | 36 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 36.70 | 33.63 | 36.81 | 28.96 | 29.90 | 36.97 | 34.67 | 32.49 | 34.67 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.11 | 9.18 | 9.37 | 9.88 | 8.40 | 10.53 | 9.50 | 9.18 | 9.89 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 28 | 27 | 25 | 34 | 28 | 28 | 27 | 28 | 29 |
| Disease + No spray | Sample points | 232 | 144 | 122 | 54 | 48 | 212 | 52 | 44 | 908 |
|  | \%age Share | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 27.49 | 23.30 | 28.80 | 16.56 | 24.04 | 29.61 | 30.56 | 28.84 | 26.90 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.65 | 10.28 | 9.27 | 10.32 | 9.24 | 10.27 | 7.21 | 9.55 | 10.56 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 39 | 44 | 32 | 62 | 38 | 35 | 24 | 33 | 39 |
| Disease + spray | Sample points | 324 | 186 | 162 | - | 24 | 467 | 24 | 46 | 1235 |
|  | \%age Share | 11 | 5 | 6 | - | 1 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 34.84 | 32.99 | 33.92 | - | 36.50 | 34.48 | 32.82 | 30.79 | 34.15 |
|  | S.D (m) | 9.34 | 9.36 | 9.25 | - | 11.51 | 9.78 | 8.17 | 9.45 | 9.55 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 27 | 28 | 27 | - | 32 | 28 | 25 | 31 | 28 |

compared to between actual rainfalls and number of water. Also both coefficients of correlation are higher in case of mean number of water and amount of rainfalls as compared to mode number of water and amount of rainfalls. It depicts a strong association between the concerned variables and utility of weighted rainfall methodology (Qayyum and Pervaiz, 2010).

## Rabi season rainfalls and wheat production

In climatic parameters, rainfalls have a great impact on the production of wheat. Table 15 shows divisional average yield of irrigated, as well as, un-irrigated areas along with their variations and monthly total rainfalls / weighted rainfalls (mm) of the Rabi season for all the years. Also
simple / rank coefficients of correlation between yield and amounts of actual / weighted rainfalls have been calculated. It is worthy to point out that rainfalls of various months of the season have different degree of impact on the yield as discussed earlier. In the analyses of rank correlations, this effect is evident that in unirrigated area maximum positive impact on yield is

Table 12. Ploughing and leveling analyses.

| No of levels | Ploughing / Leveling and yield in Punjab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Items | No of Plough |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 |  | 8 |  |
|  |  | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un | Irri | Un |
| 1 | S.Pnts | 86 | 28 | 1023 | 210 | 1704 | 166 | 1147 | 86 | 152 | 16 | 56 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | \%age | 0.4 | 1 | 4.6 | 8 | 7.6 | 6 | 5.1 | 3 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 31.8 | 11.8 | 28.2 | 11.4 | 29.7 | 13.8 | 31.7 | 16.5 | 31.0 | 17.2 | 37.7 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SD (m) | 14.0 | 6.4 | 10.5 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 7.3 | 10.3 | 7.8 | 9.8 | 13.3 | 11.7 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | 44 | 54 | 37 | 45 | 34 | 53 | 32 | 47 | 32 | 78 | 31 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | S.Pnts | 65 | - | 510 | 80 | 2400 | 268 | 5555 | 348 | 1590 | 178 | 884 | 130 | 90 | 28 | 102 | 56 |
|  | \%age | 0.3 | - | 2.3 | 3 | 10.7 | 10 | 24.8 | 13 | 7.1 | 7 | 3.9 | 5 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.5 | 2 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 32.0 | - | 29.5 | 11.8 | 30.3 | 12.3 | 31.0 | 14.4 | 33.5 | 16.9 | 33.5 | 16.9 | 34.4 | 18.7 | 33.8 | 16.6 |
|  | SD (m) | 9.3 | - | 11.6 | 6.4 | 10.2 | 5.8 | 10.1 | 6.1 | 10.2 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 8.0 | 12.2 | 8.2 | 11.6 | 9.1 |
|  | C.V(\%) | 29 | - | 39 | 54 | 34 | 47 | 33 | 42 | 30 | 52 | 29 | 48 | 35 | 44 | 34 | 55 |
| 3 | S.Pnts | 24 | - | 27 | - | 271 | 32 | 1229 | 98 | 1241 | 124 | 1134 | 88 | 220 | 54 | 128 | 38 |
|  | \%age | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | 1.2 | 1 | 5.5 | 4 | 5.5 | 5 | 5.1 | 3 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.6 | 1 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | 30.4 | - | 33.6 | - | 31.6 | 19.2 | 32.6 | 16.8 | 33.3 | 18.2 | 34.9 | 20.2 | 35.9 | 18.7 | 34.5 | 20.6 |
|  | SD (m) | 9.5 | - | 13.0 | - | 10.5 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 7.6 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 10.4 | 8.6 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 10.1 | 7.0 |
|  | C.V(\%) | 31 | - | 39 | - | 33 | 54 | 33 | 45 | 30 | 47 | 30 | 42 | 26 | 46 | 29 | 34 |
| 4 | S.Pnts | - | - | - | - | 54 | 32 | 398 | 38 | 416 | 74 | 642 | 84 | 100 | 30 | 292 | 38 |
|  | \%age | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 2.9 | 3 | 0.4 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | - | - | - | - | 30.4 | 14.4 | 32.3 | 19.5 | 33.9 | 16.8 | 35.4 | 16.3 | 32.8 | 17.3 | 35.9 | 22.0 |
|  | SD (m) | - | - | - | - | $11.4$ | $8.2$ | 9.8 | 8.4 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 6.5 | 11.3 | 8.2 | 10.2 | 12.2 |
|  | C.V(\%) | - | - | - | - | 38 | 57 | 30 | 43 | 31 | 59 | 28 | 40 | 34 | 48 | 29 | 55 |
| 5 | S.Pnts | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34 | - | 92 | 32 | 126 | - | 44 | 26 | 32 | 26 |
|  | \%age | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | - | 0.4 | 1 | 0.6 | - | 0.2 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25.0 | - | 32.6 | 23.0 | 35.7 | - | 35.1 | 20.8 | 31.6 | 22.8 |
|  | SD (m) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11.2 | - | 11.2 | 7.7 | 9.6 | - | 7.8 | 10.2 | 9.3 | 9.1 |
|  | C.V(\%) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 45 | - | 34 | 34 | 27 | - | 22 | 49 | 29 | 40 |
| 6 | S.Pnts | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | - | 32 | 18 | 84 | 18 | 14 | - | 38 | - |
|  | \%age | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | 1 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | - | 0.2 | - |
|  | Avg (m/ac) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36.9 | - | 30.1 | 26.5 | 37.6 | 22.5 | 36.0 | - | 37.1 | - |
|  | SD (m) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11.7 | - | 8.6 | 7.4 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 15.7 | - | 14.2 | - |
|  | C.V(\%) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 32 | - | 29 | 28 | 31 | 40 | 44 | - | 38 | - |

Table 13. Number of waters and crop yield.

| Number of water used in irrigated area of Punjab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of water | Items | Divisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PUNJAB |
|  |  | Lahore | G_wala | F_abad | R_pindi | Sargodha | Multan | B_pur | DGKhan |  |
| $=1$ | Sample points | 148 | 832 | 36 | 30 | 64 | - | 22 | 38 | 1182 |
|  | \%age Share | 5 | 22 | 1 | 16 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 5 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 25.02 | 27.16 | 29.00 | 27.20 | 20.69 | - | 10.61 | 15.95 | 25.83 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.67 | 10.77 | 14.78 | 8.83 | 12.90 | - | 5.86 | 8.95 | 11.37 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 43 | 40 | 51 | 32 | 62 | - | 55 | 56 | 44 |
| $=2$ | Sample points | 406 | 1380 | 216 | 48 | 254 | 164 | 116 | 120 | 2704 |
|  | \%age Share | 14 | 37 | 8 | 26 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 30.20 | 31.22 | 29.40 | 27.93 | 25.41 | 32.75 | 22.39 | 21.89 | 29.61 |
|  | S.D (m) | 11.56 | 9.44 | 11.51 | 9.18 | 8.81 | 11.55 | 11.14 | 11.51 | 10.61 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 38 | 30 | 39 | 33 | 35 | 35 | 50 | 53 | 36 |
| $=3$ | Sample points | 1054 | 1170 | 740 | 62 | 502 | 1152 | 514 | 458 | 5652 |
|  | \%age Share | 35 | 31 | 26 | 34 | 19 | 24 | 20 | 18 | 25 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 33.87 | 33.16 | 31.20 | 31.51 | 27.82 | 34.32 | 30.68 | 27.92 | 32.13 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.85 | 9.48 | 10.53 | 9.32 | 9.23 | 10.48 | 10.88 | 10.51 | 10.52 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 32 | 29 | 34 | 30 | 33 | 31 | 35 | 38 | 33 |
| $=4$ | Sample points | 1098 | 310 | 1192 | 36 | 742 | 2084 | 1100 | 748 | 7310 |
|  | \%age Share | 37 | 8 | 42 | 20 | 28 | 43 | 42 | 29 | 33 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 35.84 | 33.31 | 34.15 | 31.72 | 28.57 | 34.31 | 32.48 | 30.97 | 33.26 |
|  | S.D (m) | 9.81 | 9.51 | 9.88 | 10.43 | 8.77 | 10.75 | 9.80 | 9.77 | 10.20 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 27 | 29 | 29 | 33 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 31 |
| $=5$ | Sample points | 224 | 50 | 538 | - | 490 | 1061 | 648 | 760 | 3779 |
|  | \%age Share | 7 | 1 | 19 | - | 18 | 22 | 25 | 30 | 17 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 38.08 | 32.43 | 34.75 | - | 28.83 | 34.42 | 33.31 | 31.65 | 33.19 |
|  | S.D (m) | 9.30 | 8.77 | 10.14 | - | 8.97 | 10.31 | 9.74 | 9.60 | 9.03 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 24 | 27 | 29 | - | 31 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 27 |
| $\geq 6$ | Sample points | 58 | - | 110 | - | 640 | 321 | 222 | 436 | 1801 |
|  | \%age Share | 2 | - | 4 | - | 24 | 7 | 8 | 17 | 8 |
|  | Avg Yield (m/ac) | 34.91 | - | 34.69 | - | 27.77 | 32.95 | 29.43 | 31.41 | 30.48 |
|  | S.D (m) | 10.27 | - | 10.06 | - | 7.59 | 9.96 | 9.30 | 8.64 | 9.08 |
|  | C.V (\%) | 29 | - | 29 | - | 27 | 30 | 32 | 28 | 30 |

Table 14. Number of waters and rainfalls.

| Amounts of rainfalls and No. of waters |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | Sample points | Avg. No. of water |  | Avg. total rainfall (mm) | Avg. weighted rainfall (mm) |
|  |  | (Mode) | (Mean) |  |  |
| Gujranwala | 864 | 2 | 2.20 | 107.63 | 35.697 |
| Gujrat | 384 | 2 | 2.03 | 62.19 | 22.773 |
| Sialkot | 822 | 2 | 1.98 | 156.51 | 55.450 |
| Narowal | 456 | 2 | 2.05 | 177.50 | 57.623 |
| Hafizabad | 586 | 3 | 2.86 | 105.84 | 34.918 |
| M.B.Din | 642 | 3 | 2.73 | 187.30 | 56.341 |
| Rawalpindi | 8 | 1 | 1.25 | 301.40 | 104.580 |
| Attock | 58 | 4 | 3.17 | 226.75 | 62.180 |
| Jehlam | 96 | 3 | 2.56 | 270.18 | 80.970 |
| Chakwal | 24 | 3 | 2.83 | 191.21 | 50.970 |
| Lahore | 408 | 3 | 3.40 | 133.16 | 39.878 |
| Sheikupura | 540 | 2 | 2.54 | 108.01 | 37.249 |
| Nankana Sb | 432 | 4 | 3.41 | 70.89 | 22.285 |
| Kasur | 828 | 3 | 3.32 | 105.65 | 31.382 |
| Okara | 780 | 4 | 3.88 | 76.42 | 25.223 |
| Faislabad | 1008 | 4 | 3.79 | 84.45 | 28.432 |
| Jhang | 1062 | 4 | 3.79 | 56.47 | 16.463 |
| T.T.Singh | 762 | 4 | 3.90 | 104.47 | 34.060 |
| Sargodha | 936 | 4 | 3.38 | 121.13 | 34.848 |
| Khushab | 368 | 5 | 4.81 | 129.13 | 28.116 |
| Mianwali | 490 | 4 | 3.79 | 159.00 | 33.917 |
| Bahkhar | 898 | 6 | 5.50 | 95.02 | 23.610 |
| Multan | 762 | 4 | 4.08 | 78.65 | 21.908 |
| Khanewal | 882 | 4 | 3.92 | 72.90 | 20.790 |
| Vehari | 876 | 4 | 3.96 | 68.33 | 20.905 |
| Lodhran | 666 | 4 | 3.82 | 44.61 | 12.627 |
| Sahiwal | 906 | 4 | 4.46 | 69.16 | 27.311 |
| Pakpattan | 702 | 4 | 3.95 | 95.03 | 30.607 |
| Bahawalpur | 648 | 4 | 4.14 | 56.80 | 14.486 |
| Bahawalngar | 978 | 4 | 4.04 | 53.59 | 16.179 |
| R.Y.Khan | 996 | 4 | 4.19 | 72.30 | 21.116 |
| D.G.Khan | 520 | 4 | 3.62 | 100.42 | 25.649 |
| Rajanpur | 534 | 5 | 4.30 | 70.84 | 21.205 |
| Layyah | 660 | 5 | 4.92 | 74.24 | 15.915 |
| Muzffergarh | 846 | 4 | 4.43 | 102.94 | 28.967 |
| PUNJAB | 22428 | 4 | 3.71 | 94.64 | 28.535 |
| Correlation coefficients | Simple | Mean no of Water |  | -0.594 | -0.707 |
|  |  | Mode no of |  | -0.494 | -0.631 |
|  | Rank | Mean no of |  | -0.568 | -0.704 |
|  |  | Mode no of |  | -0.482 | -0.649 |

of October rainfall that is, $56 \%$ rank correlation and the second highest positive impact is of January rainfall that is, $54 \%$. Similarly, these two results in case of irrigated area are 21 and $41 \%$, respectively that is, January rainfall has more positive impact on yield as compared to October rainfall in irrigated area. The impact of rainfalls
on the yield of un-irrigated area is much higher than that of irrigated area, as un-irrigated area production is merely dependent on rainfalls rather on timely rainfalls. Therefore rank correlations between yield and actual rainfalls of irrigated and un-irrigated areas are 19 and $53.8 \%$ where as between yield and weighted rainfalls are

Table 15.The season rainfalls and divisional yield.

| Rainfalls in Rabi season and divisional wheat yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years | Divisions | Average yield (m/ac) |  | C.V (\%) |  | Average monthly total rainfalls (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. total rainfall (mm) | Avg. weighted rainfall (mm) |
|  |  |  |  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr |  |  |
|  |  | Irri | Unir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Irri | Unir |  |  |
| ONNON | Lahore | 32.08 | - | 30 | - | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 34.45 | 6.938 |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.92 | 15 | 30 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 30 | 0.4 |  | 58.79 | 19.259 |
|  | Faislabad | 31.63 | - | 31 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 33.60 | 9.304 |
|  | Rawalpindi | 31.98 | 15 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 51 | 17 | 40 | 9 | 151.90 | 64.104 |
|  | Sargodha | 27.25 | 9 | 32 | 44 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 27 | 4 | 47.61 | 10.788 |
|  | Multan | 30.74 | - | 31 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 22.24 | 5.637 |
|  | Bahwalpur | 27.62 | - | 32 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 30.80 | 4.609 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 28.73 | - | 36 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 31.69 | 4.306 |
| $\hat{O}$ָेò | Lahore | 35.40 | - | 30 | - | 41 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 85 | 43 | 0 | 197.27 | 63.131 |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.19 | 22 | 34 | 49 | 30 | 4 | 41 | 0 | 96 | 92 | 0 | 261.84 | 67.565 |
|  | Faislabad | 34.15 | - | 29 |  | 23 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 34 | 26 | 0 | 123.00 | 38.954 |
|  | Rawalpindi | 34.00 | 21 | 23 | 46 | 22 | 17 | 77 | 0 | 143 | 143 | 12 | 414.18 | 99.072 |
|  | Sargodha | 29.04 | 13 | 30 | 35 | 5 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 134 | 66 | 6 | 261.89 | 65.036 |
|  | Multan | 35.44 | - | 28 | - | 22 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 59 | 26 | 1 | 126.50 | 38.747 |
|  | Bahwalpur | 35.38 | - | 26 | - | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 86 | 19 | 0 | 126.44 | 33.118 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 32.25 | - | 29 | - | 6 | 5 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 40 | 0 | 121.85 | 29.790 |
| ONNेN- | Lahore | 32.28 | - | 33 | - | 0 | 3 | 11 | 24 | 7 | 4 | 32 | 49.00 | 25.574 |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.12 | 16 | 33 | 51 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 48 | 9 | 0 | 49 | 108.84 | 43.370 |
|  | Faislabad | 31.28 | - | 34 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 12 | 0.4 | 54 | 100.34 | 32.912 |
|  | Rawalpindi | 29.61 | 14 | 34 | 53 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 61 | 27 | 12 | 100 | 213.40 | 70.038 |
|  | Sargodha | 25.00 | 9 | 31 | 33 | 0 | 0.4 | 1 | 17 | 15 | 4 | 71 | 107.93 | 27.424 |
|  | Multan | 31.44 | - | 33 | - | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 29 | 58.61 | 17.444 |
|  | Bahwalpur | 29.13 | - | 37 | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 31.25 | 9.182 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 27.62 | - | 35 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 3 | 16 | 41.60 | 12.871 |
| OooO | Lahore | 36.15 | - | 33 | - | 2 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 19 | 25 | 0.3 | 71.16 | 23.146 |
|  | Gujranwala | 33.25 | 15 | 30 | 51 | 22 | 0 | 14 | 31 | 21 | 16 | 0 | 104.93 | 46.430 |
|  | Faislabad | 35.17 | - | 31 | - | 0 | 0 | 27 | 14 | 7 | 12 | 0.6 | 59.69 | 20.251 |
|  | Rawalpindi | 23.62 | 19 | 35 | 45 | 11 | 6 | 29 | 41 | 52 | 46 | 9 | 194.81 | 65.900 |
|  | Sargodha | 29.95 | 11 | 32 | 43 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 14 | 33 | 3 | 72.94 | 16.901 |
|  | Multan | 38.52 | - | 27 | - | 0 | 0 | 34 | 21 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 74.42 | 26.533 |
|  | Bahwalpur | 34.76 | - | 30 | - | 0 | 0 | 34 | 23 | 3 | 15 | 1 | 76.35 | 28.028 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 31.11 | - | 35 | - | 0 | 0 | 99 | 13 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 145.84 | 41.788 |
| Correlation coefficients between yield and rainfalls |  |  | Simple |  | Irri | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.25 | -0.09 | 0.11 | 0.05 | -0.38 | 0.051 | 0.090 |

Table 15. Contd.


Table 16. The season humidity and divisional yield.

| Humidity level in rabi season and divisional wheat yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years | Divisions | Average yield (m/ac) |  | C.V (\%) |  | Monthly average humidity level (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avgerage humidity season (\%) |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr |  |  |
|  |  | Irri | Unir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Irri | Unir |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { టO } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | Lahore | 32.08 | - | 30 | - | 56 | 50 | 60 | 60 | 55 | 52 | 29 | 51.714 |  |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.92 | 15 | 30 | 71 | 63 | 62 | 68 | 63 | 58 | 61 | 44 | 59.857 |  |
|  | Faislabad | 31.63 | - | 31 | - | 63 | 66 | 72 | 72 | 67 | 61 | 45 | 63.714 |  |
|  | Rawalpindi | 31.98 | 15 | 30 | 42 | 62 | 62 | 73 | 76 | 65 | 70 | 59 | 66.714 |  |
|  | Sargodha | 27.25 | 9 | 32 | 44 | 76 | 78 | 81 | 79 | 77 | 76 | 55 | 74.571 |  |
|  | Multan | 30.74 | - | 31 | - | 76 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 71 | 68 | 47 | 69.143 |  |
|  | Bahwalpur | 27.62 | - | 32 | - | 72 | 78 | 75 | 71 | 69 | 67 | 52 | 69.143 |  |
|  | D.G.Khan | 28.73 | - | 36 | - | 65 | 63 | 72 | 71 | 68 | 71 | 44 | 64.857 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hat{O} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { ©̀ } \\ & \text { Ǹ } \end{aligned}$ | Lahore | 35.40 | - | 30 | - | 63 | 72 | 73 | 65 | 75 | 66 | 42 | 65.143 |  |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.19 | 22 | 34 | 49 | 62 | 62 | 66 | 62 | 62 | 58 | 46 | 59.714 |  |
|  | Faislabad | 34.15 |  | 29 |  | 65 | 71 | 74 | 72 | 70 | 63 | 46 | 65.857 |  |
|  | Rawalpindi | $34.00$ | 21 | 23 | 46 | 59 | 66 | 67 | 71 | 75 | 72 | 56 | 66.571 |  |
|  | Sargodha | 29.04 | 13 | 30 | 35 | 71 | 82 | 87 | 84 | 80 | 74 | 58 | 76.571 |  |
|  | Multan | 35.44 | - | 28 | - | 75 | 76 | 80 | 76 | 79 | 74 | 49 | 72.714 |  |
|  | Bahwalpur | 35.38 | - | 26 | - | 70 | 76 | 75 | 71 | 68 | 63 | 53 | 68.000 |  |
|  | D.G.Khan | 32.25 | - | 29 | - | 63 | 62 | 66 | 66 | 69 | 67 | 56 | 64.143 |  |
| $\infty$ONNN | Lahore | 32.28 |  | 33 | , | 62 | 69 | 72 | 66 | 63 | 53 | 45 | 61.429 |  |
|  | Gujranwala | 30.12 | 16 | 33 | 51 | 56 | 60 | 64 | 62 | 58 | 54 | 53 | 58.143 |  |
|  | Faislabad | 31.28 | - | 34 |  | 57 | 67 | 71 | 70 | 63 | 51 | 48 | 61.000 |  |
|  | Rawalpindi | 29.61 | 14 | 34 | 53 | 62 | 66 | 69 | 77 | 69 | 62 | 63 | 66.857 |  |
|  | Sargodha | 25.00 | 9 | 31 | 33 | 73 | 82 | 85 | 79 | 81 | 78 | 73 | 78.714 |  |
|  | Multan | 31.44 | - | 33 | - | 64 | 74 | 80 | 79 | 77 | 73 | 50 | 71.000 |  |
|  | Bahwalpur | 29.13 | - | 37 | - | 68 | 73 | 73 | 68 | 63 | 68 | 51 | 66.286 |  |
|  | D.G.Khan | 27.62 | - | 35 | - | 65 | 66 | 72 | 70 | 65 | 68 | 57 | 66.143 |  |

Table 16. Contd.

| 2008-2009 | Lahore | 36.15 | - | 33 | - | 66 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 68 | 59 | 47 | 66.429 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gujranwala | 33.25 | 15 | 30 | 51 | 65 | 62 | 67 | 69 | 66 | 53 | 46 | 61.143 |
|  | Faislabad | 35.17 | - | 31 | - | 60 | 64 | 73 | 75 | 67 | 57 | 48 | 63.429 |
|  | Rawalpindi | 23.62 | 19 | 35 | 45 | 57 | 59 | 69 | 75 | 71 | 60 | 57 | 64.000 |
|  | Sargodha | 29.95 | 11 | 32 | 43 | 77 | 81 | 89 | 88 | 83 | 75 | 66 | 79.857 |
|  | Multan | 38.52 | - | 27 | - | 70 | 71 | 82 | 83 | 73 | 66 | 53 | 71.143 |
|  | Bahwalpur | 34.76 | - | 30 | - | 68 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 61 | 54 | 60 | 65.286 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 31.11 | - | 35 | - | 65 | 60 | 75 | 80 | 75 | 69 | 62 | 69.429 |
| Correlation coefficienhumidity level |  |  | Simple |  | Irri | -0.05 | -0.05 | -0.07 | -0.03 | -0.10 | -0.27 | -0.36 | -0.170 |
|  |  | yield |  |  | Unir | -0.81 | -0.76 | -0.77 | -0.63 | -0.53 | -0.59 | -0.55 | -0.730 |
|  |  |  | Rank |  | Irri | -0.10 | -0.05 | -0.03 | -0.05 | -0.10 | -0.33 | -0.34 | -0.140 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Unir | -0.81 | -0.75 | -0.81 | -0.79 | -0.61 | -0.76 | -0.55 | -0.800 |

20 and $65.7 \%$, respectively.

## Rabi season humidity levels and wheat production

Table 16 reveals humidity impact on the crop yield both inirrigated and un-irrigated areas separately. Like rainfalls analyses, both simple and rank coefficients of correlation have been calculated between humidity level and divisional production of wheat for all the years. A main commonality in all the coefficients of correlation is that neither value is positive that is, humidity level and production of wheat have negative association. In case of irrigated area, association between yield and humidity is minor except April average humidity, as it is the month when the crop is almost matured, ready to harvest and needs a complete hot and dry environment, so the rank correlation is $-34 \%$ that is, increase in humidity causes low yield of wheat.In case of un-irrigated area, humidity comparatively has more negative
impact on the yield. For instance, in the month of April, the association is $-55 \%$, which is more than irrigated area. The overall rank correlations between average humidity of the season and yield in irrigated and un-irrigated areas are -14 and $80 \%$, respectively that is, both have inverse relationship.

## Rabi season temperatures and wheat production

In general Pakistan climate mostly remains on extremes i.e. in winter season, the lowest temperature may be $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on the upper side of the country like Skardu and surroundings and $+10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on its lower side like interior Sindh etc. Similarly, in summer season, the lowest temperature may be $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on upper side and the highest about $+52^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on lower and middle areas of the country like Sibi and Kashmor etc. As the variation between temperatures is very high, so average temperature cannot depict its real impact
on the wheat yield, so average of maximum and minimum temperatures for each month of Rabi season has been observed for their individual analyses (Table 17). The results reveal that temperatures have opposite impact on the yield of un-irrigated and irrigated areas as both simple and rank coefficients of correlation are positive in irrigated case and negative in un-irrigated one. Also comparing monthly maximum / minimum temperatures of irrigated and un-irrigated areas, it is observed that coefficients of correlation are higher in case of irrigated area than that of unirrigated one i.e. yield of wheat in irrigated area is more influenced by temperatures as compared to un-irrigated area.
The rank correlations between yield and maximum average temperature in irrigated and un-irrigated areas are 34 and $-27 \%$ and with minimum average temperature are 31 and $-17 \%$, respectively. It indicates that yield is more affected by average maximum temperature as compared to average minimum temperature. There is $34 \%$ positive association between overall average

Table 17. The season temperatures and divisional yield.

| Temprature in Rabi season and divisional wheat yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years | Divisions | Average monthly temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Season temp (Avg) |  | Temp (Avg) |
|  |  | Oct |  | Nov |  | Dec |  | Jan |  | Feb |  | Mar |  | Apr |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min | Max | Min |  |
|  | Lahore | 33 | 20 | 27 | 10 | 22 | 4 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 27 | 14 | 35 | 19 | 27 | 12 | 19 |
|  | Gujranwala | 32 | 17 | 25 | 9 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 24 | 11 | 26 | 12 | 36 | 19 | 26 | 11 | 19 |
| 8 | Faislabad | 36 | 21 | 27 | 13 | 21 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 26 | 10 | 28 | 14 | 36 | 19 | 27 | 12 | 20 |
| N | Rawalpindi | 30 | 17 | 25 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 17 | 2 | 24 | 8 | 25 | 10 | 35 | 17 | 25 | 9 | 17 |
| ம' | Sargodha | 34 | 18 | 26 | 12 | 20 | 5 | 16 | 4 | 23 | 11 | 24 | 14 | 37 | 20 | 26 | 12 | 19 |
| 숭 | Multan | 32 | 21 | 25 | 15 | 22 | 6 | 19 | 6 | 27 | 12 | 27 | 13 | 36 | 19 | 27 | 13 | 20 |
|  | Bahawalpur | 33 | 21 | 27 | 16 | 25 | 5 | 21 | 5 | 28 | 13 | 30 | 16 | 40 | 23 | 29 | 14 | 22 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 33 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 17 | 5 | 25 | 13 | 28 | 14 | 35 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 20 |
|  | Lahore | 32 | 22 | 27 | 14 | 21 | 8 | 20 | 3 | 22 | 9 | 26 | 13 | 37 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 20 |
|  | Gujranwala | 31 | 19 | 24 | 13 | 18 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 21 | 8 | 26 | 13 | 37 | 20 | 25 | 12 | 18 |
| - | Faislabad | 33 | 20 | 24 | 13 | 17 | 7 | 18 | 4 | 21 | 9 | 26 | 13 | 37 | 20 | 25 | 12 | 19 |
| N | Rawalpindi | 32 | 17 | 26 | 13 | 19 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 18 | 7 | 22 | 10 | 34 | 17 | 24 | 10 | 17 |
| OO | Sargodha | 31 | 20 | 23 | 13 | 17 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 8 | 24 | 12 | 36 | 20 | 24 | 12 | 18 |
| $\sim$ | Multan | 32 | 21 | 26 | 16 | 20 | 8 | 21 | 6 | 21 | 10 | 26 | 13 | 38 | 21 | 26 | 14 | 20 |
|  | Bahawalpur | 36 | 22 | 30 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 23 | 8 | 24 | 11 | 31 | 16 | 42 | 26 | 30 | 15 | 23 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 32 | 23 | 26 | 18 | 21 | 11 | 19 | 7 | 23 | 11 | 28 | 15 | 40 | 22 | 27 | 15 | 21 |
|  | Lahore | 33 | 15 | 28 | 13 | 21 | 6 | 17 | 2 | 19 | 6 | 29 | 14 | 35 | 19 | 26 | 11 | 18 |
|  | Gujranwala | 31 | 17 | 27 | 12 | 20 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 19 | 6 | 29 | 14 | 33 | 17 | 25 | 11 | 18 |
| $\infty$ | Faislabad | 32 | 16 | 27 | 11 | 20 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 21 | 6 | 31 | 15 | 33 | 19 | 26 | 11 | 18 |
| N | Rawalpindi | 29 | 14 | 25 | 10 | 19 | 5 | 15 | 3 | 22 | 7 | 30 | 14 | 31 | 16 | 24 | 10 | 17 |
| へ | Sargodha | 31 | 17 | 25 | 12 | 19 | 6 | 15 | 2 | 17 | 5 | 31 | 15 | 33 | 18 | 24 | 11 | 17 |
| - | Multan | 33 | 18 | 28 | 14 | 22 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 20 | 7 | 26 | 14 | 38 | 21 | 26 | 12 | 19 |
|  | Bahawalpur | 36 | 20 | 32 | 15 | 23 | 7 | 20 | 5 | 24 | 7 | 30 | 15 | 42 | 24 | 30 | 13 | 21 |
|  | D.G.Khan | 32 | 20 | 27 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 16 | 4 | 19 | 7 | 28 | 15 | 40 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 19 |
|  | Lahore | 35 | 20 | 29 | 13 | 23 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 23 | 10 | 29 | 14 | 33 | 18 | 27 | 13 | 20 |
|  | Gujranwala | 31 | 19 | 26 | 11 | 20 | 7 | 16 | 5 | 21 | 9 | 27 | 13 | 34 | 19 | 25 | 12 | 18 |
| 인 | Faislabad | 32 | 20 | 27 | 12 | 20 | 8 | 19 | 6 | 21 | 9 | 29 | 15 | 33 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 19 |
| ¢ | Rawalpindi | 31 | 16 | 25 | 10 | 19 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 19 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 31 | 16 | 24 | 10 | 17 |
| - | Sargodha | 33 | 20 | 27 | 11 | 20 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 21 | 8 | 29 | 14 | 34 | 19 | 26 | 12 | 19 |
|  | Multan | 33 | 21 | 28 | 14 | 21 | 9 | 20 | 8 | 24 | 11 | 29 | 16 | 35 | 20 | 27 | 14 | 21 |

Table 17. Contd.

|  | Bahawalpur | 38 | 20 | 33 | 17 | 23 | 9 | 21 | 7 | 26 | 11 | 32 | 15 | 38 | 20 | 30 | 14 | 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | D.G.Khan | 34 | 22 | 28 | 14 | 19 | 8 | 17 | 6 | 22 | 11 | 27 | 16 | 32 | 19 | 26 | 14 | 20 |
| R | Simple (Irri) | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.35 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 0.20 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.39 |
|  | (Unirri) | -0.30 | -0.14 | -0.12 | 0.11 | -0.22 | 0.09 | 0.07 | -0.24 | -0.13 | -0.13 | -0.41 | -0.59 | -0.08 | -0.29 | -0.28 | -0.30 | -0.35 |
|  | Rank (Irri) | 0.26 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.35 | 0.44 | 0.55 | 0.35 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
|  | (Unirri) | -0.21 | -0.19 | -0.05 | 0.13 | -0.19 | 0.17 | 0.14 | -0.20 | -0.16 | -0.12 | -0.30 | -0.59 | -0.04 | -0.26 | -0.17 | -0.27 | -0.27 |

temperature of the season and yield in irrigated area where as $27 \%$ negative association in unirrigated area.

## Conclusions

As Pakistan is an agricultural country and has an agro-based economy, so government has to make dynamic and sound agricultural policies to attain self-sufficiency in food items especially in case of wheat, which is the most important crop of the country. Pakistan faced a very serious problem of wheat shortage in late 2007. Also Agriculture Department, government of the Punjab regularly prints instructions material for farmers to enhance the production of wheat and gives different directions about the wheat concerning variables discussed above. This study gives an unprecedented statistical / research base support to such sort of instructive material in terms of quantification of impact of these variables on the production of wheat in different dimensions.
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