

CROPPING SYSTEMS DISCRIMINATION IN TERMS OF GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION

Section	Description	Page No.
5.1	Overview	97
5.2	Hypothesis	97
5.3	Technique used	97
5.3.1	Discriminant function analysis	97
5.4	Results	98
5.4.1	Canonical Discriminant functions	100
5.4.2	Pair-wise comparison between cropping systems	100

5.1 Overview

Since groundwater extraction was observed to be significantly varying across the wells in the watershed in terms of the cropping systems irrigated by these wells, it was presumed that the cropping systems practiced in the watershed were, in a way, discriminated by the groundwater extraction pattern on individual wells. Farmers seemed to be aware of the volume of groundwater that could be extracted from their wells and, therefore, decided the crops and cropping pattern to be taken in the command area of their wells.

5.2 Hypothesis

It was examined whether groundwater extraction by different cropping systems discriminate the cropping systems practiced in the watershed in terms of water use. It was hypothesized that,

- a) the cropping systems were discriminated in terms of groundwater extraction
- b) a large percent of discrimination in the crop systems practiced was explained by the groundwater extraction over and above the variance accounted for by control variables,

5.3 Technique used

Discriminant function analysis was used to examine the hypothes.s. This analysis is used to determine whether two or more groups are significantly different from each other with regard to the mean of a particular variable. If the means for a variable are significantly different in different groups, then this variable discriminates between groups.

5.3.1 Discriminant Function Analysis

Discriminant analysis has two steps: (1) an F test (Wilks' lambda) is used to test if the discriminant model as a whole is significant, and (2) if the F test shows significance,

then the individual independent variable is assessed to see which variable differ significantly in mean by group and these is used to classify the dependent variable. Discriminant analysis shares all the usual assumptions of correlation, requiring linear and homoscedastic relationships, and untruncated interval or near interval data. It also assumes proper model specification (inclusion of all important independents and exclusion of extraneous variables). Discriminant analysis gives pair-wise group comparisons which display the distances between group means of the dependent variable in the multidimensional space formed by the discriminant functions. The pair-wise group comparisons gives an F test of significance, based on Mahalanobis distances, of the distance of the group means, enabling the determination if every group mean is significantly distant from every other group mean. The eigen value, also called the characteristic root of each discriminant function, reflects the ratio of importance of the dimensions which classify cases of the dependent variable. The unstandardized discriminant coefficients are used in the formula for making the classifications in Discriminant Aanalysis, much as b coefficients are used in regression in making predictions. The constant plus the sum of products of the unstandardized coefficients with the observations yields the discriminant scores. That is, discriminant coefficients are the regression-like b coefficients in the discriminant function.

Multiple Groups Discrimination Analysis was performed with groundwater extraction as independent variable against the cropping systems as grouping variable (dependent variable).

5.4 Results

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was performed on the data to examine the suitability of the discriminant analysis for the existing data set. The discriminant analysis assumes the homogeneity of group variances and co variances,

though, it could still be robust even with violation of this assumption. Moreover, the present analysis was performed to test the hypothesis about the discrimination in cropping system by the mean groundwater extraction and larger percentage of variance in the crop system groups being explained by the groundwater extraction over and above the variance accounted for by control variables.

The test of homogeneity of cropping system covariance worked out to be significant (Tables 5.1 through 5.3), confirming that the covariances do not differ. This was, however, interpreted in combination with log determinants, which interprets about group's covariance. The larger the log determinant, the more that group's covariance matrix differs. However, examination of log determinants for individual cropping systems revealed that during the year 2003-04, only a couple of cropping systems; pure cotton, cotton-fennel had larger determinants and pure sunflower had much smaller determinants than the rest of the cropping systems. The other systems had about similar log determinants. Similarly, during the year 2004-05, except for summer pearl millet, wheat-paddy and pure castor, the log determinants of other crop systems did not differ much. During 2005-06, in fact, despite significance of box's M (P = 0.03), all the cropping systems had about same log determinants. Therefore, despite significance of box's M, a closer look at log determinants suggested that discriminant analysis could still be used to the data set for examining the significance of discrimination of cropping systems in terms of the groundwater extraction.

The hypothesis about the equality of mean levels of groundwater extraction was tested (Table 5.4) and it was revealed that the cropping systems significantly differed in terms of the mean groundwater extracted for all the years, irrespective of the rainfall. The pooled data analysis for the three years also confirmed this observation. In the ANOVA table, the smaller the Wilks' Lambda, the greater is the importance of the independent variable, groundwater extraction, to the discriminant function. The Wilks' Lambda varied between 0.06 to 0.16 during 2003-04 to 2005-06. This was, however, significant in all the individual years as well as in pooled data, indicating importance of groundwater extraction in discriminating cropping systems. In other words, a sizeable proportion of discrimination among the cropping systems was accounted for, by the groundwater extraction. The F statistics also confirmed the significance of the discrimination functions during the three years under study.

5.4.1 Canonical discriminant functions

Further, the eigen value of canonical discriminant functions and the canonical correlations re-affirmed the observations of the analysis as explained in the previous section.

The eigen value, which is the characteristic root of the discriminant function explained the variance in the cropping system explained by the function. The eigen values for all the years turned out to be significant as revealed by the Wilks' Lambda. Also, the squared canonical correlation, which is the percent of discrimination in the cropping systems explained by the groundwater extraction, showed that more than 90 per cent variation in the dependent variable was discriminated. The low values of eigen value and canonical correlation in the pooled data of the three years can be explained by the high variability of the rainfall parameter in the pooled data set. Particularly, the year 2005-06 was an exceptionally high rainfall year, while the years proceeding it was just about the normal.

5.4.2 Pair wise comparison between cropping systems

This explains the distance between the means of cropping systems in terms of the groundwater extraction. The 'F' test based on Mahalanobis distances was used to test the significance of the distances of cropping system means.

Cotton mono crop and cotton-based cropping systems were observed to have a significant mean distances from most of the non-cotton based cropping system as well as among themselves (Tables 5.6 to 5.8). During the year 2003-04, cotton mono crop had significant distance from most of the cotton based systems except wher. combined with fennel, wheat and sunflower (Table 5.6). Further, cotton mono crop also had significant distances from most of the other mono cropping systems like paddy, castor, fennel, wheat and summer pearl millet mono crops. On the contrary, non-cotton based cropping systems were, by and large, not significantly discriminated from each other.

During 2004-05, while observations about cotton and cotton based cropping systems were about similar (Table 5.7), some of the other mono crops like fennel, cumin and summer pearl millet were also significantly different from cotton based cropping systems.

During the year 2005-06, the same observations were made on cotton based cropping systems. Cotton mono crop, however, was not significantly discriminated against the mono crop like fennel (Table 5.8). As also observed elsewhere, this year received a very high rainfall and the resultant groundwater recharge, hence mono cropping was not much practiced. The cotton based cropping systems had significant difference among themselves as well as other non-cotton based cropping systems as in previous years.

The analysis revealed distinct groups in terms of significant discrimination.

- a) Cotton and cotton based cropping systems formed one distinct group during all the years.
- b) Non-cotton based cropping systems formed another distinct group as during 2004-05.

- c) Among mono crops, cotton mono crop and others such as paddy, castor, fennel, cumin and summer pearl millet mono crops individually formed distinct groups.
- d) The non-cotton mono crops taken together did not form one distinct group as these were not significantly different among themselves.

.

CROPS	Rank	Log Determinant
Year: 2003-04	999 - Anna Mariaka a mar a raman na kata a marana kata kata kata kata kata kata kata k	
Cotton alone	1	12.140
Paddy alone	1	9.602
Castor alone	1	8.626
Cotton-fennel	1	11.529
Cotton, castor	1	8.747
Fennel alone	1	8.390
Cotton, maize	1	5.727
Sunflower alone	1	-25.969
Summer bajara alone	1	5.483
Pooled within-groups	1	11.673
Box's M		82.822
F	Approx.	12.326
	dfi	8
	df2	186.919
	Sig.	0.00

Table 5.1: Box's test of equality of covariance matrices, 2003-04

Table 5.2: Box's test of equality of covariance matrices, 2004-05

CROPS	Rank	Log Determinant
Cotton, castor	1	12.018
Cotton-cumin	1	10.957
Cotton pure	1	10.908
Cotton- fennel, cumin	1	9.811
Cotton, castor-wheat	1	9.197
Cotton-fennel	1	10.331
Cotton-summer bajara	1	8.403
Summer bajara alone	1	7.633
Paddy-wheat	1	5.973
Castor alone	1	-23.928
Pooled within-groups	1	11.143
Box's M		51.800
F	Approx.	5.613
	dfl	9
	df2	188.34
	Sig.	0.00

Cropping system code	Rank Lo	g Determinant
Cotton alone	1	12.599
Cotton-fennel, cumin	1	14.645
Cotton-fennel	1	13.623
Cotton, castor-fennel	1	15.694
Cotton-cumin	1	15.293
Fennel alone	1	11.740
Cotton, castor- summer bajara	- 1	14.788
Cotton-summer jowar	1	15.187
Cotton, castor-fennel, cumin, wheat, isabgol-summer bajari	1	14.711
Cotton, castor-fennel-summer bajara	1	15.662
Cotton-fennel-summer bajara	1	14.209
Pooled within-groups	1	14.522
Box's M		23.756
F	Approx.	2.015
	dfl	10
	df2	228.546
	Sig.	0.03

 Table 5.3: Box's test of equality of covariance matrices, 2005-06

Wilks' Lambda F dfl df2 Year: 2003-04 Groundwater extraction 0.16 11.02 18 39 0.00 Year: 2004-05 Groundwater extraction 0.06 20.56 22 31 0.00 Year: 2005-06 Groundwater extraction 0.00 0.16 7.22 26 36 Year: 2003-04 to 2005-06 Groundwater extraction 0.60 4.60 28 183 0.00

Sig.

 Table 5.4: Test of equality of group means

Period	Eigen value	Wilks' Lambda	Chi- square	Df	Significance probability	Canonical correlation
2003-04	5.09	0.164	84.89	18	0.00	0.91
2004-05	14.59	0.064	112.62	22	0.00	0.96
2005-06	5.22	0.161	87.70	26	0.00	0.91
2003-04 to	0.66	0.60	99.24	28	0.00	0.63
2005-06						

 Table 5.5: Canonical Discriminant functions

Table 5.6: Pair wise comparison among cropping systems, 2003-0 castor- paddy cotton+ castor Cotton 0	mparison among cropping systems, 2003. castor- paddy cotton+ castor Cotton Cotton	ng crop	ping sy castor (Stems,	2003-0	04 Castor col	04 Castor cotton+ fennel	1	otton+ co	tton+ co	otton+ su	nflower su	cotton+ cotton+ cotton+ sunflower sunflower+	wheat sunflower+ summer S. bajari +	tîlower+ si	ummer S.	bajari +
Cropping system	Cot+Urad pure	purecastor +	pure	+		M +	+ wheat+ p	5	flower 1	maize castor+	astor+	pure		pure	fennel	bajari ve	bajari vegetables
•		fennel		fennel	fennel castor fennel+		paddy			-	cumin					pure	
					- u +	wheat paddy											
cotton pure	8.63437.343	1	1.38517.552	7.262	1	.067	.30717.580	580	2.407 2	26.657	4.246	18.928	.1261	11.942	2.175	49.364	12.022
•	0.006 0.000		0.246 0.000 0.010 0.006	0.010	0.006	797.	.583	000	.129	000	.046	000.	.724	100.	.148	000	.001
Castor-Cot+Urad	.073		.005	.005 16.210 17.707		3.739 (-	10.499		13.015	.028	3.474	.139	1.115	.037	.146
	.789	9 .005	- 1	000.		.060			.002		100	.869	.070	117.	.297	.848	.705
paddy pure		16.210		4		7.374 1			19.081		23.357	.013	6.902	.041	2.577	.021	.045
		8.	808. 4	- 1		010	100	.343	- 1	.567	<u>00</u>	.910	.012	.840	.116	.886	.832
cotton+castor+fennel			12.238	.151		1.074	10	653		16.674	.407	12.925	1.223	11.177	3.663	16.655	11.233
			.001	669.					.788	<u>000</u>	.527	.00	.275	.002	.063	000	.002
castor pure			• •	26.889 27.440					14.520		17.933	.014	4.934	.131	1.660	.023	.138
•				000.	000	.027	.005	.575	<u> 0</u> 0.	.478	<u>000</u>	906.	.032	<u> 917.</u>	.205	.881	.712
cotton+					.306	2.749	.88226.685	685	.003 3	35.644	.154	28.252	3.040 20.102	20.102	7.468	47.182	20.194
fennel																	
					.584	.105	.353 .	<u> 80</u>		80. 0.	.697	8	.080	80.	_ [000	000
cotton+castor					-	3.901	ž.	762		35.459	.002	28.696	4.226 21.522	21.522		43.122	21.611
						.055	.202	<u>80</u>		<u>8</u> 0	.966	8	.047	<u>80</u>	.00.	000.	000
castor+fennel+wheat+paddy								3.979		8.334	2.802	5.754	.005	5.323	011.	7.422	5.361
							.561	.053	661.	900.	.102	.021	.945	.026	.386	.010	.026
cotton+wheat+paddy							7.	7.363		12.705	1.182	9.463	.431	8.374		12.198	8.423
							•	.010	.476	10.	.284	<u>8</u>	.515	.006	.151	100.	900.
fennel pure									12.924		16.361	.483	3.645	.690	.846	.817	.707
									100.	.185	00 <u>.</u>	.491	.064	.411		.372	.405
Cotton+sunflower										19.321	.135	15.267	1.894 1	13.058		19.670	13.119
										<u>8</u> 0	.715	8. 8	.177	100.	.035	000	100.
cotton+maize										.4	23.230	.357	7.875	.050	3.510	.527	.045
											000	.553	.008	.825	<u> 690</u>	.472	.832
cotton+castor+cumin												18.762	3.0411	15.849		24.168	15.915
												8 <u>0</u>	<u> </u>	<u>90</u>	.015	<u>80</u>	000
sunflower pure													5.373	.070	1.919	000	.076
													.026	.792	.174	<u> 995</u>	.785

106

Э

CROPS		addy	cotton c	astor Cotton	Cotton castor+	cotton fe	nnel cottoi	n+ cotton	cotton (sunflowe	sunflower	wheat s	castor- paddy cotton castor Cotton Cotton castor+ cotton fennel cotton+ cotton cotton sunflowe sunflower wheat sunflower summe	Ś
	-	pure	+	+ pure +fenne	+fennel+	+	pure sunflowe + + r pure	ve +	+	r pure	+	pure	pure + fennel r bajari bajari+vegetable	i+vegetable
			•••		castor wheat+wheat+	vheat+		r maize	maize castor+		drumstick		pure	52
			+		paddy paddy	paddy			cumin					
			fennel											
sunflower+drumstick												5.005	.652 6.932	5.043
												.031	.424 .012	.030

The figures in a cell are 'F' statistics and the significance probability.

Cropping system cotton,	cotton,	cotton,	cotton	cotton, c	cotton, castor	cotton, castor, col	tton, fennel cottor	cotton, cotton, castor cotton, castor, cotton, fenneicotton, castor, fenn cotton, castor, fenn cotton, castor, fe cotton, drmstick cotton, wheat,	,castor,fenn cotto	n,castor,fe cott	on, drmstick cotto	n,wheat,	fennel	cumin
	castor	cumin	bure	tennel, cumin	wheat	cumin, wheat	e i,	wheat,paddy ei,cu	min,wheat,p addy	Innel		s.bajan		
cotton. castor		.396	9.503	1 <u>1</u> 0.	5.582	.002	2.678	6.507	6.873	.291	193.455	1.914	17.834	41.324
-		.534	8	.429	.025	.965	.112	.016	.013	.594	000.	.176	000	000.
cotton, cumin	.396		2.977	.082	6.602	.144	.871	7.526	7.896	717.	180.946	.933	13.274	28.794
	534		7 60.	111.	.015	707.	.358	.010	600	404	000.	.341	.00	000
cotton pure	9.503	2.977		.976	17.684	1.879	.205	15.218	15.780	3.500	236.040	.005	8.617	22.419
•	400.	.094		.331	00 .	.180	.654	00 .	00 .	.071	000.	.945	900.	000 00
cotton,	.641	.082	.976		6.116	.301	.260	7.326	7.659	.951	155.798	.462	9.756	19.354
fennel, cumin														
	.429	777.	.331		.019	.587	.614	.011	600 [.]	.337	000.	.502	<u>8</u>	8
cotton, castor, whe	5.582	6.602 17.684	17.684	6.116		2.162	10.358	.473	.560	1.090	109.469	7.283	26.447	47.228
at	025	.015	000	019		.152	003	497	.460	.305	000	.011	000	000
cotton, castor, cum	.002		1.879	.301	2.162	un an ainm an Bhannan an Annai Christiaid de Ghróp a' Puinteann ann a	.970	3.492	3.692	.136	106.799	1.132	10.115	17.146
in,wheat														
	.965	707.	.180	.587	.152		.332	.071	.064	.714	00 .	.296	.03 03	8
cotton, fennel	2.678	.871	.205	.260	10.358	0/6		10.716	11.142	2.065	186.099	101	8.470	18.574
	.112	.358	.054	.614	.003	.332		.003	.002	.161	000.	.753	.007	0 0
cotton,castor,fenn	6.507	7.526 15.218	15.218	7.326	.473	3.492	10.716		.003	2.248	71.667	8.600	25.493	39.672
	.016	.010	<u>80</u>	.011	.497	.071	.003		.958	.144	000.	900.	000.	000
cotton,castor,fenn el,cumin,wheat,p	6.873	7.896 15.780	15.780	7.659	.560	3.692	11.142	.003		2.409	70.778	8.911	26.027	40.442
and	.013	600.	000	600	.460	.064	.002	.958		.131	000.	.005	000.	000.
cotton.castor.fenn el	.291	717.	3.500	.951	1.090	.136	2.065	2.248	2.409		99,302	2.054	12.600	20.860
	.594	404	.071	.337	.305	.714	.161	144	.131		000	.162	.001	000.

Table 5.7: Pair wise comparison among cropping systems, 2004-05

Cropping system cotton, cotton, castor cumin	cotton, castor	cotton, cumin	cotton pure	otton cotton, cotto pure fennel, cumin	cotton cotton, cotton, castor cotton, castor pure fennel, , wheat umin, whe cumin	tton,castor,c cot urnin,wheat	ton,fennelcottc el	tton.castor.c cotton.fennelcotton.castor.fenncotton.castor.fenn cotton.castor.fe cotton.drmstickcotton.wheat, urnin.wheat eI,wheat.paddy eI,cumin.wheat.p nnel s.bajari addy	n,castor,fenn cott imin,wheat,p addy	on,castor,fe cott nnel	on, drmstick cottc	on,wheat, s.bajari	fennel	Cumin
cotton, drmstick 193.455 180.946 236.040 155.798	193.455	180.9462	36.0401	55.798	109.469	106.799	186.099	71.667	70.778	99.302		129.918 182.647258.371	82.6472!	58.371
	000	000	000.	000.	000.	000.	000.	000.	000	000.		000	000	000
cotton,wheat,s.ba	1.914	.933	.005	.462	7.283	1.132	.101	8.600	8.911	2.054	129.918		4.480	8.482
Ĺ	.176	.341	.945	.502	.011	.296	.753	.006	.005	.162	000		.042	.007
fennel	fennel 17.834 13.274	13.274	8.617	9.756	26.447	10.115	8.470	25.493	26.027	12.600	182.647	4.480		.219
	000	.001	900.	<u>900</u>	000.	.003	.007	000.	000.	.001	000	.042		.643
cumin	cumin 41.324 28.794		22.419	19.354	47.228	17.146	18.574	39.672	40.442	20.860	258.371	8.482	.219	
	<u>8</u>	000	000	000.	000	000	0 0.	000.	000	000	000.	.007	.643	
cotton, is abgol	.519	.116	.359	.012	4.529	.324	.083	5.945	6.205	.882	118.896	.244	6.816	12.132
•	.477	.735	.553	.914	140	.573	.776	.021	.018	.355	000	.625	.014	.001
cotton, s. bajari	7.551	4.177	.984	2.317	15.961	3.210	1.341	15.598	16.082	4.920	188.367	.317	3.537	8.278
•	.010	.050	.329	.138	000	.083	.256	000.	000	.034	000.	.577	690.	.007
S.bajari	S.bajari 59.463 38.884 33.240 24.460	38.884	33.240	24.460	58.595	20.179	24.601	45.978	46.857	24.447	294.089	10.171	.356	.016
	000	000	<u>80</u>	8 0.	00 0.	000.	000.	000	000	000.	000.	.003	.555	006.
wheat,paddy 33.626 23.018 16.766 15.266	33.626	23.018	16.766	15.266	40.706	13.980	14.218	34.772	35.493	17.351	245.614	6.303	.004	.242
	000	80.	0 00.	00 0	00 .	.001	.001	000	000.	000.	.000	.017	.947	.626
castor,	4.801	2.985	.783	1.890	11.519	2.775	1.114	12.493	12.868	4.142	144.005	.362	2.294	4.916
wheat,paddy	.036	094	383	179	.002	.106	.200	.00	.00	.050	000.	.552	.140	.034
cotton, sunflower, f	.487	.102	.387	.008	4.448	.306	.095	5.865	6.123	.851	118.536	.261	6.903 1	12.265
	.490	.751	.539	.929	.043	.584	.761	.021	.019	.363	000.	.613	.013	.001
castor pure	17.767	11.345	6.171	7.124	26.441	7.443	5.830	23.872	24.470	9.951	214.952	2.249	.892	2.993
	000	.002	.019	.012	00 .	.010	.022	000.	8 <u>0</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>80</u>	.144	.352	.094
The figures in a cell are 'F' statistics and the significance probability.	a cell ar	e 'F' sti	atistics	and the si	gnificance	probability.								

on, s.cotton,castc bajari ennel,cum wheat,s.baj , isab	Ċ.	20 20 4	- 00	3.6	Q	12.6	0.	4	υ	4		ΰ	8.6	o.	11./	<u>o</u>	1.5	Ņ
cotton, cotton, s.cotton,castc istor, s. bajari ennel,cum bajari wheat,s.baj , isab	4.577	.039	1.400	474	.496	.003	.958	6.787	.013	1.291		.263	.073	.788	1.30/	.260	.435	.514
cotton, c castor, s. bajari	1.276	.266	14. 132	.861	.360	4.316	.045	2.060	.160	.00		577	3.895	.056	080.7	.012	.335	.566
cotton, groundnut, potato	3.498	070.	2.410 124	.129	.722	960.	.756	5.075	.030	.752		.392	.338	.565	1.995	.166	.152	669.
cotton, fennel pure castor, fennel, cumin, : bajari	14.522	.001 200	C2U.	7.062	.012	4.907	.033	35.091	000	6.668		.014	1.306	.261	044 0	.835	3.993	.053
cotton, fe castor, fennel, cumin, s.bajari	7.679	.009 009		.000	000	43.813	000	14.625	.001	14.246		.001	35.295	00.	36.649	000.	18.072	000
cotton, paddy, s.bajari	2.190	.148	4. 4. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6.	.014	906	.711	.405	3.034	060	.227		.636	1.065	309	3.250	.080		
cotton, castor	10.776	005	801. 672	4.363	044	2.581	.117	16.827	000	5.196		.029	1.101	.301			3.250	.080
cotton, cumin	7.514	000	1.407	1.623	.225	.256	.616	14.841	000	2.505		.122			1.101	.301	1.065	.309
stems, 2005-06 cotton, cotton, fennel, castor, cumin, wheat, fennel s.bajari	1.006	.322 7 523		.494	.487	2.23	.145	1.249	.271				2.505	.122	5.196	.029	.227	.636
<i>in stems</i> , cotton, cott castor, cur fennel	.038	.846 27 5 4 4		.152	.007	30.443	000			1.249		.271	14.841	000	16.827	000.	3.034	060
	8.145	.007	- /C.B	1.313	.259			30.443	000.	2.223		.145	.256	616	2.581	.117	.711	.405
rison amc cotton, fennel, cumin	3.732	.061	0.00 0.00 0.00	600 .		1.313	.259	8.152	.007	494		.487	1.523	.225	4.303	0. 440	.014	906
e com a cotton pure	16.774	000		9.839	003	9.577	004	62.541	000	7.523		600 [.]	1.467	.234	.109	.743	4.410	.043
Pair wis cotton, castor, fennel, cumin			10.7/4	3.732	.061	8.145	200.		.846	1.006		.322	7.514	600 [.]	\$.002	2.190	.148
Table 5.8: Pair wise com arison amon croCropping cotton, cottoncotton, cotton,system castor, pure fennel, fennelfennel, cumincumin	cotton,cast or,fennel,c		pure	cotton, fenn	el,cumin	cotton, fenn	e	cotton, cast	or,fennel	cotton, fenn	el,cumin,w heat,s.baja ri	:	cotton, cum	-	icasi Sec.ucilion	5	cotton, pad	uy,ə.uajarı

on, s.cotton,casto bajari ennel,cumi wheat,s.baj , isab	15.8	.0 20.7	.0 2.8	Ó N	4 . 4	.0 22	.1 4.9	ဝဝ	ы. Э
cotton, s.cotton,casto bajari ennel,cumi wheat,s.baj , isab	24.114	.000 1.417	.242 .072	.789 1.798	.188	.194	.662 .065	.800 .736	.396
cotton, c castor, s. bajari	18.745	.000 10.921	.002 1.061	.310	1.798	.188 .691	.411 1.769	.192 .122	.729
cotton, groundnut, potato	21.543	.000 2.311	.137	1.061	.310 .072	.789 .030	.865 .003	.955 .347	.560
cotton, fennel pure castor, fennel, curnin, s.bajari	51.909	000	2.311	.137 10.921	.002 1.417	.242 2.995	.092 3.413	.073 5.025	.031
cotton, fr castor, fennel, cumin, s.bajari		51.909	.000 21.543	.000 18.745	.000 24.114	.000 19.977	.000 29.330	.000 16.422	000
cotton, paddy, s.bajari	18.072	.000 3.993	.053 .152	699 .335	.566 .435	.514 .048	.828 .257	.615 .039	.844
cotton, castor	36.649	0, 0 0 4	.835 1.995	.166 7.080	.012 1.307	.260 2.510	.122 2.480	.124 4.006	.053
cotton, cumin	35.295	.000 1.306	.261 .338	.565 3.895	.056	.788 .608	441	.524 1.592	.215
cotton,cotton, fennel, castor, cumin, wheat, fennel s.bajari	14.246	.001 6.668	.014 .752	.392	.977 1.291	.263 .483	.491 1.118	.297 .077	.783
cotton, cott castor, cun fennel	14.625	.001 35.091	.000 5.075	.030 2.060	.160 6.787	.013 4.112	.050 9.391	.004 2.195	.147
cotton, fennel	43.813	.000 4.907	.033 .098	.756 4.316	045	.958 .298	.588 .113	.739 1.239	.273
cotton, fennel, cumin	28.363	.000 7.062	.012 .129	.722 .861	.360 .474	.496 .022	.883 .280	.600 .131	.719
cotton pure	7.679 61.343	.000	.874 2.476	.124 14.132	.001 1.466	.234 3.259	.079 4.169	.049 5.607	.023
cotton, castor, fennel, cumin	7.679	.009 14.522	.001 3.498	.070 1.276	.200 4.577	.039 2.885	.098 4.910	.033 1.642	.208
Cropping system	cotton,cast or,fennel,c umin,s.baj	fennel	pure cotton, gro	undnur,por ato cotto, castor,s.ba	jari cotton,s.ba	Jain cotton,cum in s iowar	cotton,s.jo	cotton, fenn	

cotton,cast ennel,cu wheat,s.baj isab	6.6	o.				3.5	o _.	9.5	o	
cotton, cotton, s.cotton,cast istor, s. bajari ennel,cu bajari wheat,s.ba , isab	.205	.653	4.130		.050	11.017	.002	.757	390	
cotton, c castor, s. bajari	3.473	.071	.596		.445	5.871	.021	5.501	.025	
cotton, groundnut, potato	.521	.475	2.899		260	9.050	.005	1.298	.262	
cotton, fennel pure castor, fennel, cumin, s.ba'ari	.404	.529	20.773		000.	35.510	000.	.016	.901	
cotton, fe castor, fennel, cumin, s.ba'ari	28.768	00. 00.	15.856		000	5.528	.024	33.416	000	
cotton, paddy, s.bajari	1.238	.273	1.500		.229	6.541	.015	2.340	.135	
cotton, castor	.477	494	11.782		.002	21.522	000	.075	.786	
cotton, cumin	.064	.802	8.607		900.	19.330	000	.539	.468	
cotton,cotton, fennel, castor, cumin, wheat, fennel s.bajari	2.526	.121	.410		.526	4.028	.052	4.025	.052	robability.
cotton, cot castor, cur fennel	10.229	.003	.437		.513	2.348	.134	14.021	.00	The figures in a cell are 'F' statistics and the significance probability.
cotton, fennel	.447	.508	12.602		.00	27.564	000	1.526	.225	and the sig
cotton, fennel, cumin	1.546	.222	3.612		.065	12.832	.00	3.077	.088	statistics a
cotton pure	.360	.552	.346 30.183		000.	.720 47.436		.00	970.	l arc 'F'
cotton, cotton castor, pure fennel, cumin	6.720	.014	.346		.560	.720	402	9.057	.005	i in a ccl.
Cropping system	fennel,s.ba jari	•	cotton, cast	or,fennel,c umin,whea t,s.bajari, isabool		cotton,cast or,fennel,s. haiari		wheat,	padoy	The figures