Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research ISSN: 2456-9879, Volume 06, Issue 02, December 2021



Agricultural Production and Economic Reforms in India (1991-2021): A Time Series Analysis

Dr. J. Jacob Stanley Inbaraj*

Abstract

The diversifying impact of Economic Reforms on various sectors reveals that agricultural production on various crops has been intensified and increased manifold. This study tries to apply ARIMA model for the time series data for a period from 1991-92 to 2020-21. Using the software Eviews7 the collected data have been analyzed and the interpretations are given accordingly. It was found that ARIMA (1,1,1) model to be the most appropriate model for the 30 years data. The analysis shows that the present growth rate in the total food grain production in the years will tend to increase based on the other related factors and its impact on the total agricultural production.

Keywords: Total food grains, ARIMA, time series.

*Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Sacred Heart College (Autonomous), Tirupattur- 635 601.

Introduction

Economic reforms are much needed and they brought about fundamental changes that were launched in 1991 with the aim of liberalizing the economy and to quicken its rate of economic growth. The reforms mainly intended to bridge the gap and to bring about cooperation of the private sector with that of public sector in the growth method of the Indian Economy. The essential features of economic reforms are – Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization (LPG).

The need of Economic reforms was much felt in order to smoothen the flaws that were prevailing in the form of poor economic performance of public sector, adverse balance of payments, fall in foreign exchange reserves, huge debts of the government, inflationary pressure and also the need for bringing out stabilization measures and to improve the efficiency in the performance of various sectors in the Economy.

A notable feature in the sphere of agriculture in the post Economic Reforms ensured a favourable shift in increasing in the production and productivity of agriculture. But the distribution was not evenly poised all over the country.

- Marketing facilities
- Adaptation to modern technology

Moreover, the decline in the capital formation, lack of adequate expenditure on irrigation and other extension services, cheap institutional credit, livelihood insecurity have led to the slow progress in the overall growth of the economy.

The history of agriculture is complex, spanning back to thousands of years across a wide variety of different geographic regions, climate, cultures and technological approaches.

Agricultural Economics is an applied social science that deals with how producers, consumers and services use scarce and natural resources in the production, processing, marketing and consumption of food and fiber products.

Major Tasks

- Government to initiate policy and programmes
- Investments for resource mobilization and deployment
- To make agriculture more vibrant and viable
- Prevention of fragmentation of land holdings
- Migration of farmers to nonfarming activities
- Coverage of credit and insurance

Review of Literature

Volkan S, Edigera, Sertac, Akarb, Cumhurbas Ankaya and Ankara (Volkan S, 2007), in their study on "ARIMA forecasting of primary energy demand by fuel in Turkey" focused on the forecasting of energy demand in emerging markets is one of the most important policy tools used by the decision makers all over the world. In Turkey, most of the early studies used include various forms of econometric modeling. However, since the estimated economic and demographic parameters usually deviate from the realizations. time-series forecasting appears to give better results. In this study, we used the Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) and seasonal ARIMA (SARIMA) methods to estimate the future primary energy demand of Turkey from 2005 to 2020. The ARIMA forecasting of the total primary energy demand appears to be more reliable than the summation of the individual forecasts. The results have shown that the average annual growth rates of individual energy sources and total primary energy will decrease in all cases except wood and animal-plant remains which will have negative growth rates. The decrease in the rate of energy demand may be interpreted that the energy intensity peak will be achieved in the

coming decades. Another interpretation is that any decrease in energy demand will slow down the economic growth during the forecasted period. Rates of changes and reserves in the fossil fuels indicate that inter-fuel substitution should be made leading to a best mix of the country's energy system.

Purna Chandra Padhan (Padhan, 2012) in his study on "Application of ARIMA Model for Forecasting Agricultural Productivity in India" has made an attempt in forecasting of any issues, events or variables requires an in-depth understanding of the underlying factors affecting it. Such is the case for forecasting annual productivity of agricultural crops. Agricultural productivity, in the context of India, extensively depends upon numerous factors namely: good rainfall, timely use of fertilizer appropriate and pesticides, favorable climate and environments, agricultural subsidies given to farmers etc. Therefore, forecasting productivity of agricultural crops is not only tedious but also indispensable, as large chunk of people depends on agriculture for their livelihood. Various uni-variate and multi-variate time series techniques can be applied for forecasting such variables. In this paper, ARIMA model has been applied to forecast annual productivity of selected agricultural

product. For empirical analysis a set of 34 different products has been considered, contingent upon availability of required data. Applying annual data from 1950 to 2010, forecasted values have been obtained for another 5 years since 2011. The validity of the model is verified with various model selection criteria such as Adj R², minimum of AIC and lowest MAPE values. Among the selected crops, tea provides the lowest MAPE values, whereas cardamom provides lowest AIC values.

Debnath M K, Kartic Bera, and Mishra P (Debanath M.K, 2013) in their study on "Forecasting Area, Production and Yield of Cotton in India using ARIMA Model" on cotton which is as an important crop in India. India is the second largest exporter of cotton next to US. This study focuses on forecasting the cultivated area and production of cotton in India using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) model. Time Series data covering the period of 1950-2010 were used for the Study. The study revealed that ARIMA (0, 1, 0) ARIMA (1, 1, 4) and ARIMA (0, 1, 1) are the best fitted model for forecasting of cotton area, production and yield in India respectively. The analysis shows that if the present growth rates continue then the cotton area, production and yield in the year 2020 will be 10.92

million hectares, 39.19 million bales of 170 kg of each and 527 kg/hectare respectively. Celik S, Karadas K and Eyduran E (Celik S, 2017) in their study on "Forecasting the Production of Groundnut in Turkey Using ARIMA Model" made an effort to forecast groundnut production amounts between the years 2016 and 2030 by using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) models. In the study, ARIMA (0,1,1) was found to be the most appropriate model among the six studied models in forecasting ARIMA the groundnut production amounts for the next 15 years. We forecasted that annual amount of groundnut production obtained in the year 2016 was 138,98 thousand tons and it reached to 167,28 thousand tons in the year 2030 with a significant acceleration for groundnut production. Forecasting results of the ARIMA (0,1,1) illustrated an increasing trend in the amount of groundnut production, and they might help to determine a better policy for increasing groundnut production in Turkey.

Pawan Kumar Sharma, Sudhakar Dwivedi, Lyaqat Ali and Arora R K (Pawan Kumar Sharma, 2018) in their study on "Forecasting Maize Production in India using ARIMA Model" made an attempt to estimate the area, production and productivity of any crop in near future.

There are several methods available for foresting the future figures and autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) is one of them. Maize is an important cereal of India, keeping in view its importance for rainfed areas of the country and diverse uses. The present study was conducted to forecast maize production for the year 2018 to 2022 based on the estimation of suitable ARIMA model. The analysis of ACF & PACF of differenced series revealed that ARIMA (2,1,0) was the most suitable model for forecasting based on the diagnostics, such as ACF, PACF, AIC, SBC etc. The selected ARIMA model predicted an increase of 13.76 percent increase in maize production in next five years w.e.f. 2017 to 2022.

The present study has been conducted by Ajay Kumar and Urmil Verma (Verma, 2020) on "Forecasting mustard yield in Haryana with ARIMA model" analyzed to find out mustard yield forecast models for Bhiwani and Hisar districts of Haryana using autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) technique. The main focus of the study is to forecast five years ahead mustard yield in the said districts. selection like The criteria Akaike information criteria and Bayesian information criteria acted as a guiding hint to decide the final models. The forecast

figures and real-time yield(s) for both the districts are compared on the basis of mean absolute percentage error to check the validity performance of the developed models.

Importance of the Study

Future of Indian agriculture is a very important question for the planners and all other stakeholders. Government should address the key challenges in the area of small holdings, primary and secondary processing units, supply chain, infrastructural facilities, efficient use of resources, marketing facilities, reducing the intermediaries, etc. This study focuses on the growth rate of agricultural production since the economic reforms from 1991 to 2021.

Statement of the Problem

Inspite of the advantageous weather and soil conditions, high demand for food, untapped opportunities, various fiscal incentives given by the government for inputs, production infrastructure, availability of cheap credit facilities, better marketing accessibility, individual startups of entrepreneurial ventures to do lot of investments, research and development and other aspects have got greater impact on total agricultural production. This study would highlight the growth pattern of some of the selected crops in terms of production over a period of time.

Objectives of the study

- To evaluate the agricultural production in India over a period of time.
- To predict the growth pattern using ARIMA model with respect to total food production.

This study is based on the secondary data collected from the reports of Reserve Bank of India. The study period covers from 1990-91 to 2020 – 21. The selected crops are rice, wheat, cereals, pulses and total food production measures in terms of lakh tonnes. The data are analyzed using MS Excel and EViews 7. Graph and tables are being presented and interpreted accordingly.

Methodology

Statistical Analysis and Interpretation

| Year | Rice | Wheat | Total Cereals | Pulses | Total Food grains |
|---------|------|-------|---------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1990-91 | 743 | 551 | 1621 | 143 | 1764 |
| 1991-92 | 747 | 557 | 1564 | 120 | 1684 |
| 1992-93 | 729 | 572 | 1667 | 128 | 1795 |
| 1993-94 | 803 | 598 | 1710 | 133 | 1843 |
| 1994-95 | 818 | 658 | 1775 | 140 | 1915 |
| 1995-96 | 770 | 621 | 1681 | 123 | 1804 |
| 1996-97 | 817 | 694 | 1852 | 142 | 1994 |
| 1997-98 | 825 | 664 | 1793 | 138 | 1931 |
| 1998-99 | 861 | 713 | 1887 | 149 | 2036 |
| 1999-00 | 897 | 764 | 1964 | 134 | 2098 |
| 2000-01 | 850 | 697 | 1857 | 111 | 1968 |
| 2001-02 | 933 | 728 | 1995 | 134 | 2129 |
| 2002-03 | 718 | 658 | 1637 | 111 | 1748 |
| 2003-04 | 885 | 722 | 1983 | 149 | 2132 |
| 2004-05 | 831 | 686 | 1852 | 131 | 1984 |
| 2005-06 | 918 | 694 | 1952 | 134 | 2086 |
| 2006-07 | 934 | 758 | 2031 | 142 | 2173 |
| 2007-08 | 967 | 786 | 2160 | 148 | 2308 |
| 2008-09 | 992 | 807 | 2199 | 146 | 2345 |
| 2009-10 | 891 | 808 | 2035 | 147 | 2181 |
| 2010-11 | 960 | 869 | 2263 | 182 | 2445 |
| 2011-12 | 1053 | 949 | 2422 | 171 | 2593 |
| 2012-13 | 1052 | 935 | 2388 | 183 | 2571 |
| 2013-14 | 1067 | 959 | 2458 | 193 | 2650 |
| 2014-15 | 1055 | 865 | 2349 | 172 | 2520 |
| 2015-16 | 1044 | 923 | 2352 | 164 | 2516 |
| 2016-17 | 1097 | 985 | 2520 | 231 | 2751 |
| 2017-18 | 1128 | 999 | 2596 | 254 | 2850 |
| 2018-19 | 1165 | 1036 | 2631 | 221 | 2852 |
| 2019-20 | 1189 | 1079 | 2745 | 230 | 2975 |
| 2020-21 | 1223 | 1095 | 2829 | 257 | 3087 |

Table 1: Statistical data on Total Cereals, Pulses and Food grains in tonnes

Source: <u>www.rbi.org.in/DBIE</u>

Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research ISSN: 2456-9879, Volume 06, Issue 02, December 2021

The above table represents the time series data on Total Cereals, Pulses and food grains produced from 1990 – 91 to 2020 - 21. It is clear from the above data that there is marginal increase in the overall production of cereals, pulses and food grains. Due to the technological

development and mechanization in Indian agriculture and using of modern equipments tend to increase the overall productivity and production at a gradual rate. Use of hybrid seeds, advanced irrigation techniques, usage of chemical fertilizers has increased the production.

Figure 1: Graphical presentation of the total cereals, pulses and food grains from 1990-91 to 2020-21.



The above graph shows the graphical presentation of the time series data of Rice, Wheat, total cereals, total pulses and total food grains over a period of thirty years since 1990-91 onwards. The graph depicts that there is an increasing trend in all the food grains production over the study period. In the year 2004-05 there is a slump

in the overall food production which caused because of the monsoon failure and other impediments. Later on, slowly by the adoption of modern techniques such as improved seeds, better irrigation facilities, etc. there was a gradual increase in the overall food grain production till 2020-21.

Econometric Model

Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) model.

Equations

Autoregressive model (AR)

 $Y_t \!=\! \alpha_1 \; Y_{t\text{-}1} \!+\! \alpha_2 \; Y_{t\text{-}2} \!+\! \ldots \!+\! \alpha_p \; Y_{t\text{-}p} \!+\! \epsilon_t$

Where

 Y_t = dependent variable at time t,

 α_i = coefficients to be estimated

 ϵ_i = series of random errors with zero mean and constant variance $\epsilon_i \approx N(0, \delta^2)$

Moving Average (MA)

 $Y_t = \epsilon_t - \phi_1 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}1} - \phi_2 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}2} \text{-} \ \dots \ \text{-} \ \phi_q \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}q}$

 Y_t = dependent variable at time t,

 ϵ_t = series of random errors with zero mean and constant variance $\epsilon t \approx N(0, \delta^2)$

 ϕ_i = parameters of the moving average model

q = degree model

 ε_{t-1} , ε_{t-2} ε_{t-p} = errors in previous time periods that are incorporated in the response of Y_t

ARMA

 $Y_t = \alpha_1 \ Y_{t\text{-}1} + \alpha_2 \ Y_{t\text{-}2} + \ldots + \alpha_p \ Y_{t\text{-}p} + \epsilon_t - \phi_1 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}1} - \phi_2 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}2} \text{-} \ \ldots \ - \phi_q \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}q}$

ARIMA

 $Y_t = \alpha_1 \ Y_{t\text{-}1} + \alpha_2 \ Y_{t\text{-}2} + \ldots + \alpha_p \ Y_{t\text{-}p} + \ldots + dY_{p\text{-}d} + \epsilon_t - \phi_1 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}1} - \phi_2 \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}2} - \ \ldots - \phi_q \ \epsilon_{t\text{-}q} + \epsilon_{t\text$

Based on the above equation the collected data were compiled and with the help of EViews the data were analyzed and presented in the following graphs and tables. In order to run an ARIMA model the first condition is to make the data stationary over the period of time. First the actual data are depicted in the form of a line graph and with the help of the pattern it can be decided about the stationarity of the data. In the graph below it is clear that the data are not stationary and its shows an increasing trend over the study period.





The above graph shows the graphical pattern of the time series data which have random walk pattern in which there is an increasing trend of the data which shows the non-stationary pattern over the years.

Figure 3: Graphical presentation of the total food grains with first order differentiation DTOTEG



After the data depicting the random walk pattern for the entire time series data first order differentiation was applied and by

which the data became stationary and ready for further statistical test and inference.

Table 2: Autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation of the Collected data

| View Proc Object Properties Print Name Freeze Sample Genr Sheet Graph Correlogram of TOTFG Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:10 Sample: 131 Included observations: 31 Autocorrelation Partial Correlation AC PAC Q-Stat Prob 1 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3.157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3.157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.0.726 0.62.15 0.00 1 1 1 0.482 0.007 55.782 0.00 1 1 1 4 0.525 0.029 66.215 0.00 1 1 1 6 0.370 -0.036 79.719 0.00 1 1 1 9 0.165 < | Series: TOTFG Workfile: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION FROM 1991-20 💶 🗙 | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Correlogram of TOTFG Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:10 Sample: 1 31 Included observations: 31 Autocorrelation Partial Correlation AC PAC Q-Stat Prob 1 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.00 1 1 1 0.820 -0.037 55.782 0.00 1 1 1 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.00 1 1 1 1 6 0.370 -0.036 79.719 0.00 1 1 1 9 0.165 0.308 88.008 0.00 1 1 1 9 0.165 0.030 88.028 0.00 1 1 1 1 1 0.033 88.048 0.00 1 1 1 1 1 0.013 0.024 88.325 0.00 1 1 1 | View Proc Object Properties Print Name Freeze Sample Genr Sheet Graph Stats | | | | | | | | |
| Autocorrelation Partial Correlation AC PAC Q-Stat Prob 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3157 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.3157 0.00 1 1 1 0.824 0.824 2.002 1 1 1 4 0.525 0.002 66.215 0.00 1 1 1 1 4 0.525 0.029 66.215 0.00 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.037 79.719 0.00 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.021 0.221 0.242 86.745 0.00 1 1 1 1 9 0.165 0.030 88.080 0.00 1 | Correlogram of TOTFG | | | | | | | | |
| Autocorrelation Partial Correlation AC PAC Q-Stat Prob 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.00 2 0.726 0.146 41.754 0.00 1 1 0.824 0.3157 0.00 1 1 1 0.824 0.3157 0.00 1 1 1 3 0.620 -0.037 55.782 0.00 1 1 1 5 0.448 0.009 74.120 0.00 1 1 1 6 0.370 -0.028 86.745 0.00 1 1 1 7 0.337 0.092 84.570 0.00 1 1 1 9 0.165 0.030 88.008 0.00 1 1 1 1 0.003 -0.072 88.325 0.00 1 1 1 1.010 0.244 89.021 0.00 1 1 <td colspan="8">Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:10 Sample: 1 31 Included observations: 31</td> | Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:10 Sample: 1 31 Included observations: 31 | | | | | | | | |
| 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.00 2 0.726 0.146 41.754 0.00 3 0.620 -0.037 55.782 0.00 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.00 5 0.437 -0.036 79.719 0.00 6 0.370 -0.036 79.719 0.00 6 0.370 -0.242 86.745 0.00 9 0.165 0.030 88.008 0.00 1 1 9 0.165 0.332 88.325 0.00 1 1 1 10 0.024 88.324 0.00 1 1 1 10 0.028 88.325 0.00 1 1 1 10 0.244 89.021 0.00 1 1 1 10 0.248 89.021 0.00 1 1 10 0.024 89.021 0.00 1 1 10 0.244 89.021 0.00 1 1 | correlation Partial Correlation AC PAC Q-Stat Prob | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 0.824 0.824 23.157 0.000 2 0.726 0.146 41.754 0.000 3 0.620 -0.037 55.782 0.000 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.000 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.000 4 1 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.000 4 1 4 0.525 -0.029 66.215 0.000 4 1 7 0.337 0.092 84.570 0.000 4 1 7 0.337 0.092 84.570 0.000 4 1 9 0.165 0.030 88.088 0.000 4 1 10 0.081 -0.090 88.325 0.000 4 1 12 -0.013 0.126 88.334 0.000 4 1 13 -0.110 -0.246 80.021 0.000 4 1 15 -0.246 -0.002 94.753 0.000 | | | | | | | | |

In the above correlogram the ACFs suffered from linear decline and there is only one significant spike in PACFs. The graph of the correlogram suggests that ARIMA (1,1,1) may be an appropriate model. Then **Table 3: Presentation of unit root test** the first order difference is taken for further statistical analysis to see whether the time series data become stationary to apply for AR(p) and MA(q)

| Null Hypothesis: DT | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|--|--|
| Exogenous: Consta | | | | | | |
| Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, max lag=7) | | | | | | |
| | t-Statistic | Prob.* | | | | |
| Augmented Dickey- | Fuller test s | statistic | -9.942943 | 0.0000 | | |
| Test critical values: | est critical values: 1% level | | | | | |
| | 5% level | | -2.967767 | | | |
| | 10% level | | -2.622989 | | | |
| *MacKinnon (1996) | one-sided p | o-values. | | | | |
| Augmented Dickey- | Fuller Test | Equation | | | | |
| Dependent Variable | : D(DTOTF | G) | | | | |
| Method: Least Squares | | | | | | |
| Date: 12/02/21 Tim | | | | | | |
| Sample (adjusted): 3 | | | | | | |
| Included observation | ns: 29 after | adjustment | S | | | |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. | | |
| DTOTFG (-1) | -1.562458 | 0.157142 | -9.942943 | 0.0000 | | |
| С | 71.86678 | 24.59967 | 2.921453 | 0.0070 | | |
| R-squared | 0.785480 | Mean de | 6.620690 | | | |
| Adjusted R-squared | endent var | 270.6873 | | | | |
| S.E. of regression 127.6731 Akaike ir | | | fo criterion | 12.60330 | | |
| Sum squared resid | 440111.3 | Schwarz | 12.69759 | | | |
| Log likelihood | -180.7478 | Hannan- | 12.63283 | | | |
| F-statistic | 98.86211 | Durbin-Watson stat 2.14: | | | | |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 | | | | | |

Now after the first order difference the time series DTOTFG becomes stationary as showing in the line graph and is free from white noise and the data become stationary. The unit root test also confirms that the first order difference becomes stationary and the level of significance is statistically accepted.

Table 4: Correlogram first order differentiation

| Series: DTOTFG Workfile: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION FROM 1991-2 🚊 📼 🗙 | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|------|--|
| View Proc Object Pro | perties Print Name | Freeze | ample Ge | nr Sheet | Graph Stat | ts I | |
| | Correlograr | n of DTOTF | G | | | | |
| Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:20 Sample: 1 31 Included observations: 30 | | | | | | | |
| Autocorrelation | Partial Correlation | AC | PAC | Q-Stat | Prob | | |
| | | $ \begin{array}{c} 1 & -0.559 \\ 2 & 0.220 \\ 3 & -0.120 \\ 5 & 0.166 \\ 6 & -0.244 \\ 7 & 0.317 \\ 8 & -0.306 \\ 9 & 0.155 \\ 10 & -0.011 \\ 11 & -0.031 \\ 12 & 0.020 \\ 13 & 0.057 \\ 14 & 0.038 \\ 15 & -0.054 \end{array} $ | 9 -0.559 0 -0.135 0 -0.135 0 -0.153 6 0.124 4 -0.117 7 0.168 3 -0.059 5 -0.083 1 0.054 1 0.054 0 -0.088 7 0.196 0 -0.127 4 0.083 | 10.339 11.995 12.506 12.521 13.581 15.969 20.154 24.289 25.384 25.384 25.389 25.438 25.460 25.647 25.722 25.910 | 0.001 0.002 0.006 0.014 0.019 0.014 0.005 0.002 0.003 0.005 0.003 0.005 0.008 0.013 0.019 0.028 0.028 0.039 | | |
| · ų · | ' 4 ' | 16 -0.064 | + -0.101 | 26,191 | 0.051 | | |

From the above correlogram it is clear that only one spike is extended outside the confidence interval level it means that the residuals of this selected ARIMA model are of not with white noise, so there are no other significant patterns left in the time series, so the model is fit for further evaluation. So, the ARIMA (1,1,1) is the best model.

Table 5: Regression test on total food grains over the period of time

| Dependent Variable | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------|--|--|
| Method: Least Squa | | | | | | |
| Date: 12/02/21 Tim | ne: 10:22 | | | | | |
| Sample (adjusted): 2 | 2 31 | | | | | |
| Included observations: 30 after adjustments | | | | | | |
| Convergence achiev | /ed after 13 | 6 iterations | | | | |
| MA Backcast: OFF | (Roots of M | A process t | oo large) | | | |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. | | |
| С | 1533.482 | 142.8500 | 10.73491 | 0.0000 | | |
| AR(1) | 1.060859 | 0.016841 | 62.99206 | 0.0000 | | |
| MA(1) | 0.233655 | -6.066287 | 0.0000 | | | |
| R-squared | pendent var | 2265.467 | | | | |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.952010 | S.D. dep | 392.8668 | | | |
| S.E. of regression | 86.06348 | Akaike in | 11.84269 | | | |
| Sum squared resid | 199986.9 | Schwarz | 11.98281 | | | |
| Log likelihood | -174.6403 | Hannan- | 11.88751 | | | |
| F-statistic 288.6488 | | Durbin-W | 2.271067 | | | |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Inverted AR Roots | 1.06 | | | | | |
| Estimated AR process is nonstationary | | | | | | |
| Inverted MA Roots | 1.42 | 1.42 | | | | |
| | Estimated MA process is noninvertible | | | | | |

The residual diagnostics tests show that the over fitting process is used and the goodness of fit of the ARIMA (1,1,1)

values show that the value standards are fit and it is relied that this is the appropriate model when compared to other models.

Table 6: Correlogram first order differentiation

Date: 12/02/21 Time: 10:24 Sample: 2 31 Included observations: 30 Q-statistic probabilities adjusted for 2 ARMA term(s)

| Autocorrelation | Partial Correlation | | AC | PAC | Q-Stat | Prob |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| | Partial Correlation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | AC -0.159 0.091 -0.162 -0.101 0.042 -0.221 0.106 -0.333 -0.007 -0.022 0.011 | PAC -0.159 0.067 -0.142 -0.158 0.026 -0.234 -0.009 -0.342 -0.240 -0.240 -0.146 -0.215 | 0.8385 1.1196 2.0510 2.4291 2.4963 4.4452 4.9134 9.7508 9.7532 9.7764 9.7826 | 0.152 0.297 0.476 0.349 0.427 0.136 0.203 0.281 0.368 |
| | | 12 13 | 0.141 | -0.162 | 10.838 | 0.370 |
| | | 14 15 16 | 0.121 -0.033 -0.083 | -0.031 -0.054 -0.188 | 13.614 13.685 14.154 | 0.326 0.396 0.438 |
| | | | | | | |

Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research ISSN: 2456-9879, Volume 06, Issue 02, December 2021

In the above correlogram since there are no significant spikes of ACFs and PACFs, it is concluded that there is stationarity in the data series and most of the values within the confidence interval and that the significant value of autocorrelation coefficients by using the Q statistic test.

Conclusion

The impact of economic reforms on agriculture is a mixed challenge. Changing demand due to increase in incomes, health consciousness will affect the agricultural production in the future. Use of biotechnology and breeding will be very important in developing eco-friendly and disease resistant, climate resistant, more nutritious and tastier crop varieties. India has improved remarkably in its digital connectivity and market access has become very easy.

Works Cited

Celik S, K. K. (2017). Forecasting the production of groundnut in Turkey using ARIMA model. *The Journal of Animal and Plant Sciences*, 920-928.

Debanath M.K, K. B. (2013). Forecasting Area, Production and Yield of cotton in India using ARIMA model. *Journal of Space Science and Technology*, 16-20.

Padhan, P. C. (2012). Application of ARIMA model for forecasing Agricultural

Productivity in India. Journal of Agriculture and Social Sciences, 50-56.

Pawan Kumar Sharma, S. D. (2018). Forecasting Maize Production in India using ARIMA model. *Agro Economists*, 1 -6.

Verma, A. K. (2020). Forecasting mustard yield in Haryana with ARIMA model. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 136 - 140.

Volkan S, E. S. (2007). ARIMA forecasting of primary energy demand by fuel in Turkey. *Elsevier*, 1701 - 1708.

www.rbi.org.in/DBIE