



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Vol XVI
No. 2

ISSN 0019-5014

APRIL-
JUNE
1961

INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS



INDIAN SOCIETY OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
BOMBAY

INDICES OF YIELD IN AGRICULTURE*

Introduction

The concept of productivity has found wide usage in current economic literature. While its significance in industry is greatly stressed it is no less important in agriculture. In fact, agriculture can also be regarded as an industry for purposes of productivity analysis. Productivity may generally be defined as a measure of the overall efficiency of industry. While several factors have a bearing on the overall efficiency of an industry, it is possible to measure this in terms of only one factor at a time.¹ The productivity of a specified factor (*e.g.*, labour or land) is therefore measured by the ratio of output to the input of the factor.

The productivity of land assumes great importance in agriculture for the simple reason that land is a scarce commodity ; the area under cultivation cannot be indefinitely increased especially in countries like India where land has been already fully exploited. It is therefore necessary to produce the maximum output from the land available for cultivation. Raising the productivity of agriculture (used synonymously for productivity of land) has been one of the major objectives of our Five-Year Plans. Agricultural productivity in a broader sense can be measured in terms of the yield per acre. The present study therefore attempts to define certain indices for measuring changes in yield per acre in India and to evaluate the agricultural production programme in the light of these indices.

The limitations of Indian agricultural statistics are well known. Considerable efforts have been made in recent years to effect an improvement in the accuracy of agricultural statistics. Whether or not any improvement has occurred, it has to be borne in mind that any analysis based on the data suffers from the limitations of the data themselves. The data on which the indices are based are the statistics of area and yield of principal crops published in the annual season and crop reports.² Two different procedures have been outlined in this paper.

*Framework of the Indices*³

(a) *The first approach* : The first approach consists of the computation of the yield per acre of the principal crops and to express the yield per acre for any year 't' in terms of the yield per acre in the base year. Denoting by a_{it} , p_{it} the area and production of crop 'i' in the year 't' and a_{i0} , p_{i0} the corresponding figures for the base year, then the yield per acre of the crop 'i' in the base year and the current year 't' are given by

$$\frac{p_{i0}}{a_{i0}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p_{it}}{a_{it}} \quad \text{respectively.}$$

*The author wishes to express his gratitude to Mr. H. A. Fell, UNTAO Expert at the Demographic Training and Research Centre for his valuable comments on this paper.

1. See "Measurement of Industrial Productivity," K. E. Vaidyanathan, *Finance and Commerce*, December, 1959.

2. Taken from the Monthly Abstract of Statistics, Government of India Central Statistical Organization, January 1960, pp. 63-65.

3. *Vide* Pearson and Bennet : Statistical Methods Applied to Agricultural Economics.

The yield index for the specified crop in respect of year 't' will be

$$\left(\frac{p_{it}}{a_{it}} \div \frac{p_{io}}{a_{io}} \right) \times 100$$

The crops have been classified into two broad groups, viz., food crops and non-food crops. The food crops have been further divided into two sub-groups, viz., cereals and pulses and the non-food crops have been divided into 4 sub-groups, viz., oilseeds, fibres, plantation crops and miscellaneous. The group and sub-group indices are obtained by weighting the specific indices by the areas under the crops in the base year. The general form of the index is given by

$$I_y^t = \frac{\sum \left(\frac{p_{it}}{a_{it}} \times \frac{a_{io}}{p_{io}} \right) a_{io}}{\sum a_{io}}$$

This can be interpreted in another way also. Expressing the numerator in the form

$$\frac{\frac{p_{it}}{a_{it}} \times a_{io}}{p_{io}} \times a_{io} = \lambda_{it} a_{io} \text{ (say),}$$

where λ_{it} expresses the productivity relative for the year 't'. Thus

$$I_y^t = \frac{\sum \lambda_{it} a_{io}}{\sum a_{io}} \times 100$$

is the weighted average of productivity relatives for individual crops, the weights being the area under each crop in the base year. The agricultural year 1951-52 has been chosen as the base year as this year marks the beginning of planned development and hence this year will be suitable for comparison.

(b) *The second approach* : In the second approach the All-India index numbers of agricultural production (compiled by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture) has been used in studying changes in yield per acre. The all-India index of agricultural production covers 28 crops divided into two main groups and six sub-groups. Weights have been assigned to the different commodities in proportion to the total value of production of each commodity during the base period, viz., year ending June, 1950. The output has been evaluated at the annual harvest prices prevailing during the year, except in some cases where wholesale prices have been used with appropriate adjustment. The index numbers have been constructed by the chain base method in order to provide for changes in the estimated production due to extension in the geographical coverage or to variation in the method of estimation over time. The sub-group and the group index numbers are the weighted arithmetic averages of the production indices of the crops covered; the concept of production for the series is gross, no allowance being made for seed or wastage.

The first step in making use of the index number of agricultural production was to shift the base from 1949-50 to 1951-52 to ensure comparability with the first approach. To measure changes in yield per acre, the production indices have to be deflated by the changes in area. The change in area of any crop, group or sub-group relative to the base year is given by

$$I_a^t = \frac{a_{it}}{a_{io}} \times 100$$

If I_p^t denotes the index numbers of agricultural production for year 't', then

$$\frac{I_p^t}{I_a^t} \times 100 = I_y^t$$

is a measure of the change in yield per acre in year 't' in relation to the base year.

These two approaches do not give the same figure in respect of I_y^t in view of the fact that the first approach is based on area as weights whereas in the second approach value of crop output has been used as weights in the construction of I_p^t . While studying the trends over a period one has to make use of one of these two methods. But the first method is preferable for the following reasons : (1) it takes into account the changes in the yield of different crops; (2) area has been used as weights and hence it is more relevant to the study of yield of land.

Recent Trends in Yield

The trends in productivity revealed by the two methods indicate considerable fluctuations in yield per acre since 1951-52. The overall picture is that yield has been at a high level since 1951-52 when compared with 1951-52 and the peak has been reached in 1958-59. While there are differences in the group and sub-group indices obtained by the two methods, one may expect the first approach to portray the situation more accurately. Table I compares the yield indices (I_y^t) obtained by the first approach with the corresponding indices of area (I_a^t).

TABLE I—COMPARATIVE TRENDS IN YIELD AND AREA: 1951-52 TO 1958-59

(Base 1951-52 = 100)

Year (t)	Food Crops		Non-Food Crops		General Index	
	I_y^t	I_a^t	I_y^t	I_a^t	I_y^t	I_a^t
1951-52	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1952-53	109.4	105.3	101.6	96.6	107.9	103.7
1953-54	122.0	112.5	113.2	96.4	120.3	109.4
1954-55	119.9	111.2	115.4	106.9	119.0	110.4
1955-56	112.6	114.0	105.8	109.7	111.3	113.2
1956-57	115.1	114.9	113.2	112.7	114.7	114.5
1957-58	110.7	112.1	108.2	112.0	110.2	112.1
1958-59	124.9	115.4	120.2	112.8	124.0	114.9

The productivity indices specific for each crop show that the maximum gain (51.3 per cent) in yield has been recorded by gram, whereas there has been actually a decline in yield in respect of tur, other pulses, black pepper and chillies. India's staple food crops, viz., rice and wheat have recorded an increase in yield of 28.1 per cent and 20.4 per cent respectively. The specific indices also reveal considerable fluctuations from year to year mainly due to differences in seasonal conditions.

$$y = a + bx$$
$$x = t - 1951-52$$

using the data given in Table I, the following trend lines were obtained :

	Trend lines
Food Crops	
Yield 107.96 + 1.82x
Area 104.35 + 1.81x
Non-Food Crops	
Yield 102.83 + 1.96x
Area 96.79 + 2.60x

Using these trend lines the "expected values" of the yield and area indices were arrived at for 1951-52 to 1960-61. Table II gives the expected values for 1959-60 and 1960-61.

TABLE II—EXPECTED VALUES OF I_y^t AND I_a^t

[illegible]

Implications on Planning

The above analysis shows that it is possible to express agricultural production in terms of two components, viz., yield and area. With the usual notation,

$$p = y \times a$$

expresses this relationship. If δ_p , δ_y and δ_a denote the gains in production, yield and area respectively during the plan period, then

$$\frac{p + \delta_p}{p} = \frac{y + \delta_y}{y} \times \frac{a + \delta_a}{a}$$

or

$$(1 + \frac{\delta_p}{p}) = (1 + \frac{\delta_y}{y}) (1 + \frac{\delta_a}{a})$$

This model has enabled the estimation of the probable levels of output in 1960-61. Using the expected values of I_y^t and I_a^t given in Table II, the results are set out in Table III.

TABLE III—ANTICIPATED LEVELS OF AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT: 1960-61

Item									Percentage increase over 1955-56
Food Crops									
Yield	7.90
Area	8.11
Output	16.64
Non-Food Crops									
Yield	8.86
Area	12.13
Output	22.05

This shows that the production of foodgrains is likely to increase by 16.64 per cent during the Second Plan period as against the target of 23 per cent contemplated in the plan. The situation regarding non-food crops is more sanguine but even here the targets are not likely to be achieved.

K. E. VAIDYANATHAN*

*Demographic Training and Research Centre, Chembur, Bombay.

APPENDIX

INDICES OF AGRICULTURAL YIELD BY GROUPS AND SUB-GROUPS

(Base 1951-52 = 100)

Groups				1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Sub-Groups										
<i>1st Method</i>										
Foodgrains	109.4	122.0	119.9	112.6	115.1	110.7	124.9
Cereals	110.9	125.0	122.3	114.3	117.2	114.6	126.8
Pulses	103.2	109.7	109.8	105.4	106.3	94.6	117.0
Non-Food Crops	101.6	113.2	115.4	105.8	113.2	108.2	120.2
Oilseeds	101.2	115.6	117.0	107.9	111.8	102.5	122.4
Fibres	105.0	116.2	116.5	104.2	120.5	119.8	122.5
Plantation Crops	103.4	98.7	104.3	109.2	111.0	111.0	111.0
Miscellaneous	94.9	99.2	108.5	101.6	101.0	101.2	108.0
General Index	107.9	120.3	119.0	111.3	114.3	110.2	124.0
<i>2nd Method</i>										
Foodgrains	105.4	116.2	113.5	111.1	115.1	105.8	121.9
Cereals	105.7	117.8	114.2	112.8	117.0	108.0	122.8
Pulses	104.0	107.2	112.4	106.1	109.9	96.5	120.9
Non-Food Crops	97.2	98.3	102.3	99.1	104.3	103.3	109.6
Oilseeds	98.7	113.2	117.4	107.8	114.5	111.1	125.7
Fibres	100.9	98.7	97.7	95.0	107.7	104.1	112.5
Plantation Crops	106.2	93.9	101.8	100.9	103.2	105.3	109.9
Miscellaneous	94.8	100.2	107.3	101.9	101.6	100.7	105.6
General Index	100.9	107.1	108.7	105.9	110.7	104.8	117.0