

RESEARCH NOTE

Trends and Decomposition of Agricultural Growth and Crop Output in Gujarat: Recent Evidence

Itishree Pattnaik and Amita Shah*

ABSTRACT

The growth story of Gujarat's agriculture (with around 10 per cent growth rate in the recent phase) has received considerable attention and is often hailed as a role model for other states to follow. In this context, it is therefore important to examine the major factors contributing to this high growth performance. This paper tries to identify these factors by undertaking a decomposition analysis with reference to price, area, cropping pattern and yield. The decomposition analysis suggests that the individual effect of price alone has increased over time along with a reduction in the yield effect. The price-area interaction effect which was negative during the 1990s turned out to be positive in the recent phase. Similarly, the interaction of yield and price has become positive in the recent phase. This implies most of the crops for which there was substantial price increase show favourable change in yield and area. increase, shows favourable changes in yield and area.

Keywords: Decomposition of crop output, Price area interaction effect, Yield effect

JEL: Q11, Q16

I

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture in Gujarat has witnessed a phenomenally high rate of growth of about 10 percent per annum during the last decade (Dholakia, 2007; 2010, Shah *et al.*, 2009, Gulati *et al.*, 2009). Till then, the sector was viewed as a relatively lagging and highly fluctuating segment of the state's economy. The growth performance is particularly significant as it has come about at a time when the agricultural growth in several other comparable states was found to be fairly low or moderate. The growth story of Gujarat's agriculture thus has received significant attention and is often hailed as a role model for other states to follow. In this context, it is therefore important to examine the major factors contributing to this high growth performance during the recent period. Since the growth rate alone does not provide detailed explanation for the performance of agricultural sector, the analysis of decomposition of output growth would help gauging the reliability of the growth model. In this context the present paper aims to: (a) examine the trends in area, production and yield of major crops and hence, the pattern of growth in Gujarat's agriculture during the 1990s and 2000s; (b) examine sources of growth in agriculture by using decomposition analysis for two sub-periods covering the past two decades; and (c) discuss implications thereof.

*Assistant Professor, Director and Professor respectively, Gujarat Institute of Development Research (GIDR), Ahmedabad.

The analysis is organised into five sections including the introduction. The second section discusses the scope and methodology used for decomposition analysis. This is followed by an analysis of the growth performance of Gujarat's agriculture sector in the third section. The fourth section presents the results of the decomposition analysis and fifth section discusses the implications of the main findings.

Gujarat's Agricultural Growth: Some Important Observations

A number of researchers have highlighted the high-growth experience in the last decade, particularly during 2003-07 (Gulati *et al.*, 2009, Shah *et al.*, 2009, Dholakia, 2010, Dholakia and Sapre, 2011, Arya and Mehta, 2011, Shah and Pattnaik, 2012). Some of the key drivers, noted by various researchers include: large scale adoption of GM-technology (for Bt-cotton), massive campaign for rain water harvesting, power sector reforms, lab-to-land extension programme and market support including credit (Gulati, *et al.*, 2009, Shah *et al.*, 2009). Beside these, modernisation of agricultural practice, crop diversification and better infrastructure facilities with proper marketing system also seem to have influenced the growth of agricultural sector in the recent period (Kumar *et al.*, 2010). Increased use of inputs such as seeds of high yielding varieties (HYVs), fertiliser and irrigation along with rainfall continue to remain as important factors in explaining the growth in agricultural output in the state (Mehta, 2012). Development of irrigation, especially under the Sardar Sarovar Project (SSP), augmentation of ground water, and a long stretch of favourable monsoon seem to have helped reducing uncertainty in agricultural production in the last decade. Together, these factors have further improved the conditions for growing high-value crops such as cotton, spices, fruits, vegetables and oilseeds.

It is however, not clear as to how far the growth process has reached out to the poorer sections of the society. The question is particularly relevant to the context since agricultural growth in the state is heavily tilted towards those having access to irrigation and has adopted Bt-cotton in addition to some high value crops like spices. It is likely that high growth trajectory may have bypassed some of the weaker sections of the farming communities and regions and that there may be a significant disconnect between the high growth in agriculture and some of the important developmental indicators.

One of the plausible explanations for the alleged disconnect could be found in terms of the sources or major drivers of growth in agricultural output in the state since rural development depends upon the linkage between agricultural growth and rural non-farm sector. However the relationship between agricultural growth and non-farm sector has weakened during the recent phase. It was also observed that there was a decline in the productivity-led (through technology) agricultural growth in India during the recent decade (Sharma, 2011) implying a decline in the importance of the real factors of production in agricultural growth. The pattern of agricultural growth was mainly driven by price induced growth (Gupta *et al.*, 2011; Jha, 2011). Jha, (2011) pointed out that, the 'price induced agricultural growth is not as strong as that

of the technology induced growth in agriculture'. Thus he established the fact that the growth in crop production in the recent period¹ (in India) is not duly supported by the growth of the real factors of production. However significant growth has been accounted by prices rather than (mainly) productivity (p.29).

A similar phenomenon might hold true for Gujarat, especially in the light of the fact that Gujarat's agriculture has undergone a major shift towards high value non-food crops as against food grains (Dixit, 2009, Pattnaik and Pathak, 2012). However, this is not an entirely new phenomenon since crop diversification or commercial orientation has been an important hall of Gujarat's agriculture over a long period of time. What seems to have happened is a further strengthening of the process during the last decade. The questions arising from the recent experience are: Whether and to what extent the growth has been influenced by price? Whether the influence of price has increased during the recent period?² This paper tries to address these questions by undertaking a decomposition analysis where price has been included as an important factor besides area, cropping pattern and yield. The analysis is placed in the backdrop of a brief profile of the pattern and performance of agriculture sector in the state by covering a fairly long time period.

II

DECOMPOSITION OF OUTPUT GROWTH: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The analysis of the sources of growth by using decomposition method is not new in the research of understanding agricultural performance. The decomposition method of growth trend was first presented by Minhas and Vaidyanathan (1965). They had estimated the change in value of agricultural output by segregating the changes in four major factors: area, yield, cropping pattern and the interactions among the three. They have used the additive method for working out the effects of the four factors. Deviating from the additive method Parikh (1966) adopted multiplicative model for decomposition analysis. The major difference between the two is that the estimates in the additive method are based on absolute growth rates in outputs as against using relative growth rates in the case of multiplicative method. Moreover, the additive method explicitly includes residual impacts as 'interaction schemes', which is not the case for the other method.

Following the initial work, Minhas and Vaidyanathan (1965) expanded the four-factor model to seven factors model where they included area, yield, cropping pattern, area-yield, area-cropping pattern, yield-cropping pattern and overall interaction term. A similar model has been used by Mishra (1971) and by Sondhi and Singh (1975) for carrying out decomposition analysis in the case of Gujarat and component analysis of Indian foodgrain economy respectively.

In a major departure, Sagar (1977, 1980) tried to introduce current price as an additional factor for decomposition of agricultural growth by using eight components, i.e., four individual components (area, yield, price, cropping pattern) and four

interaction terms (cropping pattern-yield, cropping pattern-price, yield-price and yield-crop pattern and price). Sagar pointed out that price reflects the relative share of different crops in monetary terms, which might change over time due to change in taste and preference or due to the technical and physical constraint obtained in a region/economy. These aspects need to be captured independent of the impact of shift in cropping pattern, which is assumed to be driven mainly by relative profitability at given set of output prices. Jamal and Zaman (1992) has also attempted to decompose the conventional 'residual term' by using new indices like price, quantity and yield change. They have used the log-transformation to make the analysis convenient. However, their model did not have the residual term. Other major important contributions in terms of analysing relative impact of area, yield and their interaction have come from Dashora *et al.*, (2000), and Sanker and Chakraborty (2002) who have used seven-factor additive method. Majumdar and Basu (2005) attempted to understand the change in the effects of different components on the absolute growth of output over the period 1970-71 to 1999-2000. They have considered three components, area, yield and cropping pattern by using the additive method but without any residual terms.

Introduction of locational component in the decomposition method was yet another methodological development in the field. In his initial work Narain (1977) incorporated locational effect along with yield and cropping pattern as three main gross components. He postulated that a positive locational component implies shift of crop location from low productivity to high productivity area. The effort for further refinement of decomposition analysis has continued till recently. Among these, contribution by Kurosaki (2002) is noteworthy. He used a three-step process of decomposition by decomposing output into area and productivity and again decomposing both individually. The static effect turns positive when area under crops whose yields were initially high increases relatively, whereas dynamic shift effect becomes positive when area under dynamic crops increases relatively to the area under non-dynamic crops.

A brief review of literature on decomposition analysis in the Indian context thus suggests that although scholars have used different methods for decomposition of growth in agricultural output, there is no clear indication about the superiority or suitability of one method over the other. However, the additive method is a preferred one to the multiplicative method because the results obtained from the former could be interpreted in a straightforward manner compared to the latter (Mishra, 1971).

For the present analysis, we have tried to examine the component of production growth by considering price as a factor. The methodology used in the study is based on the decomposition analysis used by Sagar (1977). This involved defining a price structure by comparing relative movements in prices (in real terms) of a specific group of agricultural commodities (e.g. oilseeds) with overall average prices of all commodities taken together. Taking all the prices in constant or real terms helps in obtaining the net change in prices of the specific commodity groups as well as for all

commodities taken together. According to Sagar [1977; p.109] an analysis such as this could provide meaningful insights into the pattern of agricultural growth and has useful policy implications.

The equation used for the decomposition analysis is as follows

$$Q^1 - Q^0 = (A^1 - A^0) \sum_c a_c^0 y_c^0 p_c^0 + A^1 \sum_c a_c^0 y_c^0 (p_c^1 - p_c^0) + A^1 \sum_c a_c^0 p_c^0 (y_c^1 - y_c^0) + A^1 \sum_c y_c^0 p^0 (a^1 - a^0) + A^1 \sum_c a_c^0 (y_c^1 - y_c^0) (p_c^1 - p_c^0) + A^1 \sum_c y_c^0 (a_c^1 - a_c^0) (p_c^1 - p_c^0) + A^1 \sum_c p_c^0 (a_c^1 - a_c^0) (y_c^1 - y_c^0) + A^1 \sum_c (a_c^1 - a_c^0) (y_c^1 - y_c^0) (p_c^1 - p_c^0)$$

where,

1 and 0 means the current period and base period respectively.

Q_c = physical quantity of the c-th crop, presented in the money value of the agricultural output

A_c = gross crop area under c-th crop

a_c = proportion of gross crop area under c-th crop.

y_c = yield of c-th crop.

p_c = deflated price of c-th crop. Deflated price (p_c) = Current price of c-th crop (P_{cr}) / [Laspeyres' index of agricultural prices during the i-th period/index at the base year].

As indicated in the equation, the total impact on value of agricultural production is to be captured through eight sets of effects consisting of four individual effects namely, cropping pattern (i.e., proportion of area under the selected crops), price, yield and area; and four interaction effects covering yield and price; yield and cropping pattern; cropping pattern and price; and second order interaction between yield, price and cropping pattern.

Sources of Data Collection

The present analysis is based on information about fifteen major crops grown in Gujarat. These are: paddy, wheat, jowar, bajra, tur dal, groundnuts, castor, mustard, cotton, tobacco, sugarcane, chillies, potato, total fruits and spices. We have used prices of selected crop as proxy for calculating the contribution of fruits³ and spices in Gujarat. Obtaining the data on prices for all the fruits, vegetables and spices, produced in the state was very difficult. To surmount this limitation, we have considered a proxy for each group. We have considered those crops from each category, which covers the maximum area under cultivation. Mango, a major fruit crop in Gujarat, constitutes around 36 percentage of the total area under fruit crops and 40 percentage of the total value of output. Thus, we have considered price of mango as the proxy of the total fruits. Similarly, cumin is considered as the proxy variable which represents total spices.⁴ It covers 63 percentage of the total area under spices in Gujarat and 60 per cent of the value of output during 2008-09 (CSO, 2011).

Time series data for area, yield and production of the selected crops, covering the period 1990-91 to 2009-10 have been compiled from official sources. Wholesale

price for the selected agricultural commodities have been used for calculating the value of output, and Laspuyer's index was used for obtaining deflated prices of the crops selected for the study.

The present paper analyses the agricultural growth and decomposition of crop output for two periods. i.e., 1990-99 and 2000-10. Gujarat's agriculture has witnessed a different growth trajectory, particularly after the early 2000s. The net state domestic product (NSDP) from agriculture at constant prices (1999-2000) shows a breakthrough after 2000. The year 2003-04 marked a significant departure from the past trend of growth in NSDP (Appendix 1), thus suggesting a structural break in the growth process (Shah and Pattnaik, 2012). The annual average growth rate for the period 2003-04 till 2010-11 was 9.97 per cent as noted earlier (the growth rate for the period 2000-01 to 2010-11 was estimated at 10.75 per cent).⁵

III

TREND IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY AND CROPPING PATTERN IN GUJARAT

Cropping Pattern of Major Crops

The information presented in Table 1 clearly shows that there has been a major decline in the area cultivated under cereals and increase in the area cultivated under cotton and fruits and vegetables. During 1990-91, around 50 percent of the gross cropped area (GCA) in the state was under foodgrains (cereal and pulses), which has drastically dropped to 29 per cent in 2010-11. The major gainer in this category was cotton as its share has increased from 9.6 in 1990-91 to 20.7 per cent in 2009-10 (Table 1). Even though the area under groundnuts declined over the period, it still constituted around 15 per cent of the total cropped area during 2010-11.

The average area under wheat, tur, groundnut, castor, cotton, sugarcane, potato and fruits and vegetables has witnessed increase during the recent period as compared to the 1990s. There was a major decline in the area cultivated under bajra, jowar and paddy (Table 2). Thus, there was a change in the cropping pattern towards the cultivation of wheat, groundnut, cotton and fruits and vegetables and those are the major players of growth during the recent decade.

Yield Performance of Major Crops

During the past decade, yield of most of the major crops, grown in the state has registered substantial increase (Table 3). Among oilseeds, groundnut is a relatively major gainer in terms of yield during the period as compared to mustard and castor. Compared to cereals and oilseeds, cotton stands out as the best performing crop in terms of increase in yield; the average yield level increased significantly from 288 thousand bales during 1990s to 631 thousand bales during 2000-10. This suggests a slightly more than two times hike in average cotton yield, much of which is of bt-

variety. With about one fourth of the area under cotton, a significant jump in the crop productivity, combined with somewhat superior quality and hence, better price realisation may have made a major contribution to the significant growth in agri-NSDP during the decade - a point already made by several scholars (Shah *et al.*, 2009, Gulati *et al.*, 2009, Dholakia, 2010).

TABLE 1. RELATIVE SHARES OF MAJOR CROPS IN GROSS CROPPED AREA

Crops (1)	1990-91 (2)	1995-96 (3)	2000-01 (4)	2005-06 (5)	2010-11 (6)
Paddy	6.5	9.5	6.6	6.4	5.7
Wheat	5.9	5.4	3.4	8.0	7.4
Jowar	6.8	4.5	2.3	1.3	1.4
Bajra	13.1	11.7	8.2	8.6	5.7
Tur	2.2	2.0	3.1	2.2	2.2
Groundnuts	16.7	16.5	17.5	17.4	15.3
Castor	3.4	3.7	4.2	3.0	3.5
Mustard	3.1	3.0	2.2	2.9	1.8
Cotton	9.6	13.4	16.1	18.1	20.7
Sugarcane	1.2	1.6	2.5	2.3	1.6
Tobacco	1.3	1.2	1.1	0.7	1.2
Chillies	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Potato	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5
Fruits and vegetables	2.1	2.4	3.6	6.0	6.8
Spices	4.8	3.9	2.7	2.3	2.4
Total area	77.4	79.6	75.9	79.7	76.3
Total cereals	41.7	32.7	28.2	28.9	24.8
Total pulses	9.5	7.8	7.1	6.2	5.5
Total oilseeds	25.7	26.5	27.5	24.9	21.8

Source: Compiled from various volumes of *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat* and *Socio Economic Review*. Data on Spices: National Horticultural Board.

Note: The data presented here pertains to the years that had experienced more or less normal rainfall.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE AREA UNDER MAJOR CROPS IN GUJARAT

Crops (1)	1990-99 (2)	2000-2010 (3)	Percent change (4)
Paddy	783	710	-9.3
Wheat	631	810	28.4
Jowar	597	174	-70.9
Bajra	1348	882	-34.6
Tur	235	285	21.3
Groundnut	1889	1916	1.4
Castor	353	370	4.8
Mustard	335	277	-17.3
Cotton	1391	2039	46.6
Sugarcane	171	241	40.9
Tobacco	121	90	-25.6
Chillies	8	9	12.5
Potato	41	44	7.3
Fruits and vegetables	275	511	85.8
Spices	444	436	-1.8

Source: Compiled from various volumes of *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat* and *Socio Economic Review*. Data on Spices: National Horticultural Board.

Note: Area presented in 000 ha.

TABLE 3. AVERAGE YIELD OF MAJOR CROPS

Average yield of major crops (1)	1990-99 (2)	2000-10 (3)	Percent change (4)
Paddy	1543	1682	9.02
Wheat	2216	2558	15.4
Jowar	678	1139	67.9
Bajra	969	1266	30.6
Tur	777	576	-25.8
Groundnut	849	1303	53.4
Castor	1834	1706	-6.9
Mustard	1143	1466	28.2
Cotton	288	631	119.1
Sugarcane	7240	6534	-9.7
Tobacco	1759	1799	2.3
Chillies	4990	4687	-6.1
Potato	423	483	14.2

Source: Compiled from various volumes of *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat* and *Socio Economic Review*.

The increase in yield, as expected, is accompanied by higher levels of instability (measured by coefficient of variation) or variability over time. Table 4 depicts the changing scenario with respect to growth in yield and coefficient of variation (cv) over the two time periods. It may be noted that, whereas paddy, wheat, castor, mustard and tur were in the category of low growth in yield during 1990-99, they have shifted to the category of higher rate (between 3 to 10 per cent) of growth in the subsequent period. Among the major crops, which registered higher rates of growth in yield during 2000-10, cotton and tur outperform the rest of the crops. Of all the crops, cotton has attained a major shift from the growth rate ranging between 3-10 per cent to the highest range of above 10 per cent growth in yield during 2000-10.

TABLE 4. GROWTH RATE (AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE) AND INSTABILITY OF YIELD PER HECTARE IN GUJARAT

Growth rate/CV (1)	Below 3 per cent (2)	3-10 per cent (3)	10 per cent-above (4)
1990-99			
Below 10 per cent	Wheat, Potato, Tobacco, Sugarcane, Chillies	—	—
10-20 per cent	Paddy, Mustard, Castor, Tur	—	—
20-30 per cent	—	Cotton	Bajra, Jowar
30 per cent above	—	—	Groundnut
2000-10			
Below 10 per cent	Sugarcane, Chillies, Tobacco	—	—
10-20 per cent	Potato	Jowar, Wheat, Mustard, Castor	Paddy, Bajra
20-30 per cent	—	—	Tur
30 per cent above	—	—	Cotton, Groundnut

Source: Compiled from various volumes of *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat* and *Socio Economic Review*.

The picture with respect to instability in yield as reflected by cv, is quite different as compared to the yield growth. It is interesting to note that whereas the number of crops having low cv (i.e., below 10) have decreased from five to three over the two

sub-periods, what is particularly noteworthy is that the two crops, viz., tur and cotton, having attained relatively higher increase in growth rates have also undergone corresponding shift with respect to the cv (Table 4). Conversely, jowar represents a case where both growth rate and cv were high during the first sub-period, but has slid down to low growth with a corresponding low cv in the second sub-period. Overall picture suggests that the number of crops with lowest growth rate has decreased whereas, that with the higher cv has increased. However, if we consider some of the major crops like cotton, groundnut, bajra, and tur with relatively higher growth rate (> 10 per cent) during the second sub-period, we find them in the category of relatively higher instability of yield. The phenomenon thus raises the issue of sustainability of yield growth especially in the wake of fluctuating rainfall, which is an old feature of agriculture in the state.

Production of Major Crops in Gujarat

The production performance of the major crops in Gujarat for two periods has been presented in Table 5. During the 1990s, the growth rate of almost all the major crops was below 10 per cent. Only groundnut witnessed annual average growth rate above 20 per cent. Instability of most of the crops was below 30 per cent; however, the production of cotton, tobacco and groundnut witnessed high instability. On the contrary, during 2000-10 the instability of all the crops had increased without significant increase in the rate of growth. Cotton, which is considered as one of the important drivers of growth, has witnessed an increase in both annual average growth rate as well as instability. During the recent period, the crops that have registered increase in growth rate compared to earlier period include tur, mustard, tobacco, wheat and cotton. However, the instability has also increased for these crops.

TABLE 5. GROWTH RATE (AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE) AND INSTABILITY OF PRODUCTION IN GUJARAT

Growth rate/CV (1)	Below 3 per cent (2)	3-10 per cent (3)	10 per cent-above (4)
1990-99			
Below 10 per cent	Chillies, Potato	—	—
10-20 per cent	Tur	Paddy, Castor, Sugarcane	—
20-30 per cent	Jowar, Mustard	Bajra, Wheat	—
30 per cent above	Tobacco	Cotton	Groundnut
2000-10			
Below 10 per cent	Chillies	—	—
10-20 per cent	Potato	Tur	—
20-30 per cent	Jowar,	Paddy, Bajra, Mustard, Castor	—
30 per cent above	Sugarcane	—	Groundnut, Wheat, Cotton, Tobacco


Source: Compiled from various volumes of *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat* and *Socio Economic Review*.

The above analysis presents the broad overview of the trend in area, cropping pattern, yield and production of major crops, taken into consideration for the two

period analysis in Gujarat. The trend in crop productivity shows that output growth has been noticeably different in the two periods.

Value of Production

Figure 1 presents trends in value of production of six (out of 15) major crops selected for the study. It is observed that whereas groundnut and cotton have witnessed the highest increase in value of production, the value of groundnut is found to be the most volatile among all the crops. Interestingly, both these crops have witnessed simultaneous increase in area, yield and prices. A similar pattern is also found in the case of fruits and vegetables that account for a fairly substantial share in the total value of agricultural production in the state. In fact most of the crops whose value of production has undergone substantial increase, have also witnessed increase in the area under cultivation. It may be noted that the prices of these three crops, viz., cotton, groundnut and fruits and vegetables are generally higher than other crops that selected for the analysis. This may imply that the significant growth (close to 10 per cent) achieved in agriculture NSDP during the past decade is contributed by only a few crops, especially cotton, thus suggesting a fairly limited base from which the growth has taken place in the crops sector; this of course leaves livestock sector which has also grown significantly during the past decade in the state (Shah and Pattnaik, 2012).



Note: Value in Rs. crores.

Figure 1. Value of Production of Major Crops in Gujarat

IV

DECOMPOSITION OF OUTPUT GROWTH IN GUJARAT

This section presents the results of the decomposition analysis based on fifteen major crops accounting for about 75 to 80 per cent of the gross cropped area as noted earlier. These crops account for about 84 per cent of the total value (at 1990-91 prices) of all crops grown in the state. Table 6 presents percentage share of each of the 15 crops in terms of the total value of these crops. The idea is to see the changes in the relative share of each crop over time by keeping the price factor constant.

It may be noted that five crops, viz., wheat, groundnut, cotton, sugarcane, fruits and vegetable have a share of more than 10 per cent in the total value of output. Together these five crops account for 71 per cent of the total value of crops presented in Table 6. It is observed that whereas paddy, wheat and fruits and vegetables have increased their relative share during the two sub-periods, cotton and jowar are the major gainers during the last sub-period. Sugarcane and groundnut have different patterns as could be seen from Table 6. The scenario, however, is likely to be quite different if the impact of relative price movements is included. The decomposition analysis in this section captures this effect.

TABLE 6. SHARE OF MAJOR CROPS IN THE TOTAL VALUE OF CROP OUTPUT
(AT 1999-00 CONSTANT PRICE)

Crops (1)	1990-91 (2)	1999-2000 (3)	2010-11 (3)
Paddy	6.1	5.2	3.8
Wheat	8.4	5.1	6.7
Jowar	1.7	0.9	0.4
Bajra	5.1	4.9	1.9
Tur	4.7	1.9	1.5
Groundnuts	11.7	9.2	14.1
Castor	11.7	7.8	4.5
Mustard	3.8	3.3	1.8
Cotton	10.8	11.9	25.9
Sugarcane	9.8	14.6	4.8
Tobacco	4.9	4.3	0.4
Chillies	1.0	0.7	0.2
Potato	1.0	2.1	2.0
Fruits and vegetables	10.9	23.1	23.3
Spices	5.0	3.3	7.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note (i) The value of each crop is presented in constant term. Laspayer's index is used to convert the current value to constant. (ii) the highlighted figures indicate increase in the relative share with respect to the previous period.

Contribution of Different Factors in the Growth of Production

An attempt has been made to identify the sources of production growth. It implies to what extent a change in production is contributed by area, yield, price and cropping pattern. In order to evaluate the share of each factor in the change in

production, a decomposition analysis has been carried out. The fifteen major crops that we have considered for the purpose of decomposition have covered around 75 to 80 per cent of the total cropped area over the period 1990-91 to 2010-11. The value of the selected crops taken together had grown at an average rate of 7.89 per cent per annum during 2000-10 compared to the 5.54 per cent growth rate during 1990-99. Considering the value of those crops as 100 per cent, the impact of area, yield and prices on the increase in production has been calculated. As mentioned above, the formula for calculation of the factors contributing to changes in output can be divided into eight parts. First four parts include the individual effects and the rest indicates the interaction effects. The decomposition of the total output has been calculated for the two phases. The aim is to understand whether the factors influencing growth in output has changed over the period or not. The decomposition analysis helps us to understand the growth pattern via its different component and their interaction effects. As noted by Sagar (1980) “besides providing estimates of growth contributed by these components, the analysis also help in deducing hypotheses on causes and effects of a specific growth pattern”.

Table 7 is self-explanatory. In both the phases yield has emerged as the single largest component of growth in the value of output. However, there are significant variations in the relative impacts of the other effects. For instance, during the 1990s, cropping pattern was the second largest effect after yield; this has become negative during the 2000s. Against this, the price effect has increased from about 13 per cent in the 1990s to 23 per cent in the 2000s. The area effect has also increased, though marginally. It is pertinent to note that despite having the highest value during both periods, the yield effect has declined from about 56 to 52 per cent during the two periods. A part of this could be due to increased impact of the price component.

TABLE 7. CONTRIBUTIONS OF FACTORS ON THE TOTAL PRODUCTION FOR PERIOD:
1990-99 AND 2000-10

Effects of the components (1)		1990s (2)	2000s (3)
	Individual effects		
Area effect		16.39	17.41
Cropping pattern effect		27.20	-1.50
Price effect		13.09	23.36
Yield effect		56.27	51.93
	Interaction effects		
Cropping pattern and yield effect		0.23	1.20
Yield and price structure effect		-5.19	7.04
Cropping pattern and price structure		-6.69	0.88
Yield, crop pattern and price structure effect		-0.95	-0.32
Total		100	100.0

Another interesting finding is that the two interaction effects that includes price (i.e., yield and price; and cropping pattern and price) have turned out to be positive during the 2000s as against their negative effects obtained during the 1990s. This

once again highlights the relative importance of price effect – independent as well as interaction – during the latter period. The second order interaction term taking yield, cropping pattern and price, remained negative in both the periods. The second order interaction effect however, is very small, i.e., less than one per cent.

It is also important to note that the individual effects during the 1990s were substantially higher as compared to the latter period. This is mainly due to the fact that the interaction effects during the first period were mainly negative; the effects that have turned positive during the next period have incorporated price as interactive components. The evidence therefore drives home the two main findings: (a) the largest effect of yield though, with lower value in the second period; and (b) substantial increase in price effect –individual as well as interaction – over time.

The findings, to a large extent, support the results of the study by Sagar (1977; 1980). In turn, this may also reinforce the argument put forward by Jha (2011) indicating that price-led growth in agriculture may render limited welfare outcomes for the rural communities.

V

DISCUSSION

The foregoing analysis clearly demonstrated the changing profile of Gujarat's agriculture in the wake of high growth trajectory during the past decade. This was demonstrated by a shift in cropping pattern mainly towards cotton, fruits and vegetables, wheat and groundnut. Most of them are water intensive crops. The shift in area has also been accompanied by increased yield among the major crops with the exception of bajra, castor and the water intensive crop; sugarcane. Cotton and tur have outperformed most of the crops in terms of growth in yield, with cotton scoring very high in terms of growth rate. The high growth rate in value of agricultural output is contributed mainly by five crops accounting for 71 per cent of the total value. These crops also happen to be high valued crops such as cotton, groundnut, wheat, sugarcane, fruits and vegetables. What is however, concerning, is that the crops with better growth performance are also showing high variability in yield.

The above changes in cropping pattern and yield bring home the point that the recent growth experience in Gujarat's agriculture is characterized by limited crop base on the one hand and increased instability among the high performing crops on the other. Price factor may tend to further increase the variability over time as the top five major crops, by and large, are known to be high valued commercial crops (as noted above).

The decomposition analysis tried to examine the relative importance of four major factors, viz., area, cropping pattern, yield and prices. The analysis brought out two important findings: (a) the largest effect of yield though, with lower value in the second period; and (b) substantial increase in price effect –individual as well as interaction – over time. The results suggest that the individual effect of price alone

has increased over time from 13 per cent in the 1990s to 23 per cent in the 2000s. This suggests increasing impact of price on the allocation of area under crops. This has been brought out by the fact that the price-area interaction effect which was negative during the 1990s turned out to be positive in the recent phase. Similarly, the interaction of yield and price has become positive in the recent phase. This implies most of the crops for which there was substantial price increase shows favourable changes in yield and area during the recent phase. The present analysis clearly shows that with the increase in the growth of agricultural sector in the recent decade there was a decline in the yield effect and increase in the price effect.

Understanding of the present pattern of agricultural growth is essential for the next round of discussion of Gujarat agricultural development and other developmental issues. This analysis provides a useful context for re-thinking agricultural development in the important state of Gujarat.

Received March 2013.

Revision accepted July 2015

NOTES

1. The growth rate of agricultural real gross domestic product (GDP) has increased to 2.62 percent during 2006-07 to 2010-11 compared to 2.08 per cent growth rate during 1997-98 to 2004-05. (Chand and Parappurathu, 2011).
2. However the possible implication of this type of growth model is out of the scope of the present paper. The likely implications of the growth model has been discussed in a broader study by Shah and Pattnaik (2014).
3. In order to obtain the value of total fruits, we have used the wholesale price of Mango (one of the major fruits in Gujarat) as a proxy. Major fruits cultivated in Gujarat include, mango, chiku, citrus, banana, guava, pomegranate, papaya and custard apple. During 2008-09, total area under fruits was 339 thousand hectare, out of which mango constitute around 118 thousand hectare (CSO, 2011).
4. The major spices cultivated in Gujarat, are Cumin, Fennel, Chilly, Ginger, Garlic, Turmeric, Isabgul and Suva. It was difficult to obtain the data on wholesale price of spices thus; we have considered the wholesale price of Cumin as the proxy for calculating the value of the spices in Gujarat (CSO, 2011).
5. For detail check Shah and Pattnaik (2014).


REFERENCES

- Arya, A., and N. Mehta (2011), "Performance of Gujarat Economy: An Analysis of Growth and Instability", Working Paper No. 7, Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, Ahmedabad.
- Chand Ramesh and S. Parappurathu (2011), "Historical and Spatial Trends in Agriculture: Growth Analysis at National and State Level in India", Paper presented in the Workshop on 'Policy Options and Investment Priorities for Accelerating Agricultural Productivity and Development in India', India International Centre, New Delhi, November 10-11.
- Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) (2011), *State wise Estimate of Value of Output from Agriculture and Allied Activity with New Base Year 2004-2005 (2004-05 TO 2008-09)*, Central Statistics Office (CSO), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, access from the web link: http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/finBrochure%20value%20of%20out%20put%202011.pdf
- Dashora, S.K., J.M. Dhaka and N.J. Agrwal (2000), "Growth in Production of Important Pulses Crops in Rajasthan", *Agricultural Situation in India*, Vol. 52, No. 8, November.

- Dholakia, Ravindra (2007), "Sources of Economic Growth and Acceleration in Gujarat", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 52, No. 9, March, pp-770-778.
- Dholakia, Ravindra (2010), "Has Agriculture in Gujarat Shifted to High Growth Path?", in R. Dholakia and S. Datta (Eds.) (2010), *High Growth Trajectory and Structural Changes in Gujarat Agriculture*, published by Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
- Dholakia, Ravindra and Amey Sapre (2011), "Sources of Economic Growth and Acceleration in Gujarat", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 52, No. 9, March, pp-770-778.
- Dixit, A. (2009), "Agriculture in High Growth State: Case of Gujarat (1960 to 2006)", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 50, December 12 pp. 64-70.
- Gulati, Ashok, Tushaar Shah and Ganga Shreedhar (2009), "Agriculture Performance in Gujarat since 2000: Can it be a *Divadandi* (lighthouse) for Other States?", IWMI and IFPRI, New Delhi.
- Gupta H.S., Suresh Pal, Alka Singh and I. Sekar (2011), "Agricultural Growth and Diversification for Food Security", in Suresh Pal (Ed.) (2011), *Agriculture for Inclusive Growth*, published by Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, pp-20-36.
- Jamal, H. and A. Zaman (1992), "Decomposition of Growth Trend in Agriculture: Another Approach", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 47, No.4, October- December, pp.644-652.
- Jha, Brajesh (2011), *Policies for Increasing Non-Farm Employment for Farm Households in India*, Working Paper No. 310, Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi.
- Kumar, Dinesh M., A. Narayanamoorthy, P. Singh, M.V.K. Sivamohan, M. Sharma and N. Bassi (2010), *Gujarat's Agricultural Growth Story Exploding Some Myths*, Working Paper No. 2-0410, Institute of Resource Analysis and Policy, Hyderabad.
- Kurosaki, Takashi (2002), "Agriculture in India and Pakistan 1900-95, A Further Note", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 37, No. 30, July 27- August 2, pp.3149-3152.
- Majumdar, Kakali and Partha Basu (2005), "Growth Decomposition of Foodgrains Output in West Bengal: A District Level Study", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 60, No. 2, April-June, pp-220-234.
- Mehta, Niti, (2012), *Productivity and Resource Structure: Underlying Dimensions of Agricultural Development in Gujarat*, Working Paper No. 11, Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, Ahmedabad.
- Minhas B.S. and A. Vaidyanathan (1965), "Growth of Crop Output in India: 1951-54 to 1958-61 – An Analysis by Component Elements", *Journal of Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics*, Vol. 17, No. 2, December.
- Mishra, V.N. (1971), "Growth of Crop Output in Gujarat: A Component Analysis", *Anvesak*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Narain, Dharm (1977), "Growth of Productivity in Indian Agriculture", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 32, No.1, January-March, pp. 20-32.
- Parikh, Ashok (1966), "State Wise Growth Rate in Agricultural Output-An Econometric Analysis", *Artha Vijnana*, Vol. 8, No.1, March pp.1-15..
- Pattnaik, Itishree and Jharna Pathak (2012), "Instability in Current Agricultural Pattern in India: A Step towards Finding Sustainable Agriculture". Paper presented in 'Tropentag-2012', held at Georg-August-Universität Göttingen and University of Kassel-Witzenhausen, September 19-21, 2012, Germany.
- Sagar, Vidya (1977), "A Component Analysis of the Growth of Productivity and Production in Rajasthan: 1956-61 to 1969-74", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 32, No.1, January-March, pp-108-119.
- Sagar, Vidya (1980), "Decomposition of Growth Trends and Certain Related Issues", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 35, No.2, April-June, pp. 42-59.
- Sanker, Debnarayan and Sanjukta Chakraborty (2002), "Growth Crisis of Foodgrains Production in West Bengal", *Agricultural Situation in India*, Vol. 58, No.11, February, pp.515-516.
- Shah, Amita and Itishree Pattnaik (2012), "Agricultural Transformation in Gujarat: Some Reflections", presented in the National Seminar on "Understanding Growth Story of Gujarat" Organised by Centre For Development Alternatives (CFDA), Ahmedabad, May 7-8, 2012.

- Shah, Amita and Itishree Pattnaik (2014), "High Growth Agriculture in Gujarat: An Enquiry into Inclusiveness and Sustainability", in Indira Hirway, Amita Shah, and Ghanshyam Shah (Eds.) (2014), *Growth or Development: Which Way is Gujarat Going?*, Oxford University Press, India, chapter 6, pp.225-263.
- Shah, Tushaar, A. Gulati, P. Hemant, G. Shreedhar and R.C. Jain (2009), "Secret of Gujarat's Agrarian Miracle after 2000", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 52, December 26, pp-45-55.
- Sharma, Vijay P. (2011), *India's Agricultural Development under the New Economic Regime: Policy Perspective and Strategy for the 12th Five Year Plan*, W.P. No. 2011-11-01, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
- Sondhi, Rajinder and Karam Singh (1975), "Component of Foodgrain Economy of India", *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, September, pp.225-270.

APPENDIX 1.



Source: *Statistical Abstract of Gujarat*, various issues.

Note: The vertical line represents the structural break point in Gujarat's agricultural-NSDP. The year 2003-04 was identified as the break point by considering the agricultural-NSDP series from 1960-61 till 2010-11. The author has used the Bai-Perron method for calculating the structural break in NSDP. This method identifies endogenous break point in a series by considering different regimes all together. The Bai-Perron test helps to find out the change in both intercept and slope parameter (m). The model is considered as the pure structural break model (Dholakia and Sapre, 2011).

Figure. Trend of Agricultural - NSDP and Rainfall in Gujarat