Dynamics of Cropping Pattern in Karimnagar District of Telangana – A Markov Chain Approach

D. A. Rajini Devi[1*], R. Uma Reddy[1], B. Madavi[1], P. Ravi[1] and P. Sadvi[1]

[1]*RARS, PJTSAU, Jagtial, 505327, Telangana, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author DARD designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors RUR and BM managed the analyses of the study. Author PR managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The assessment of shift in cropping pattern in several regions is crucial for a much better insight into the agricultural development method. The present study was undertaken to examine the dynamics of cropping pattern in Karimnagar district of Telangana. The data was collected from Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Telangana from 1966-67 to 2016-17 and it was analysed with the help of Markov chain by decade wise and for last decade, analysed for five periods. The major findings from the study revealed that any set of crops did not retain its area in Karimnagar, but the acreage of the crops was continuously shifting from one set of crops to another set throughout the period. The cereals area was observed to be more stable while the loss of area from cereals towards commercial crops like cotton and turmeric etc. Indicated that the cropping pattern of the region moves towards diversification in northern Telangana zone. There is a larger scope for deciding within the choice of crops to place the agriculture on the pedestal of property growth that has to be thought-about in analysis and extension programmes.

Keywords: Shift; development; decade; analysis; growth; diversification.

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: raj116.agrico@gmail.com, darajinidevi@gmail.com;

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture practice is one of the important sectors of Telangana state economy in India. This sector contributed about 13% of the total state income. At about 56% of the total population of this state is dependent on agriculture [1]. There are several studies on the economics of paddy cultivation for grain production [2-8] and seed production in other crops [9,10]. The gross cropped area was 356478 ha. whereas net cropped area accounts to 2432023 ha. with cropping intensity of 1.28 in Karimnagar district. The average size of holding is 132439.8 ha. as per the 2010-11 census. The cultivated area was irrigated majorly by dug wells followed by tube wells, tanks and canals by 191446 ha., 44334 ha., 6866 ha. and 122 ha. respectively. Hence, Karimnagar was one of the potential districts for agriculture in the state.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Markov Chain Analysis is the associate application of dynamic programming to the answer of a random call method. A finite Markoff process could be a model whereby the result of a given trial 't' (t = one, 2, …. T) depends only on the outcome of a preceding trial (t-1) and this dependence is same at all stages of the sequence of trials [11]. Consistent with this definition, let the S_i represents ith state or possible outcomes; i = 1, 2,...,r , Wit represents the probability that state S_i occurs on trial t or proportion observed in trial 't', in alternative outcome state i of a multinomial population based on sample size n, i.e. Pr (S_{it}). Pij represents the transitional probability which denotes the probability that if for any time t the process is in state S_i, it moves on next trial to state S_j,

i.e. $Pr(S_i , t +1 / S_{it},) = P_{ii}$

Pr = (Pij) represent shift chance matrix that denotes shift chance for each try of states (i, j = 1,2, ..., r) and has the following properties;

$0 \leq Pij \leq 1$ (1)

$\sum = nj1 P_{ii} = 1$ (2)

Given this set of notations and definitions for a first-order Markov chain, the probability of particular sequence Si on trial t and Sj on trial t + 1 may be represented by

$Pr (S_{it} , S_i \, t +1 = Pr (S_{it},) Pr (S_i \, t + 1 / S_{it}) = Wit P_{ij}$ (3)

and the probability of being in state j at trial t + 1 may be represented by

$Pr (S_i \, t -1) = \sum i \, W_{it} \, P_i$ or, $W_i , t +1 = \sum i \, W_{it} \, P_{ii}$ (4)

The data for the study is the proportion of the area under crops. The crops were grouped into cereals, pulses, oilseeds, commercial crops, fruits and vegetables. The proportion changes from year to year as a result of factors like weather, technology, price and institutional changes etc. It is reasonable to assume that the combined influence of these individually systemic forces approximates to a stochastic process and propensity of farmers to move from one crop to another differs according to the crop state involved. The process of cropping pattern change may be described in the form of matrix P of first-order transition probabilities. The element P_{ii} indicates the probability of a cropped state i in one period will move to crop state j during the following period. The diagonal element Pij measures the probability that the proportion share of ith category of the crop will be retained. Estimation of Transitional Probability Matrix: Equation (4) can be used as a basis for specifying the statistical model for estimating transitional probabilities. If errors are incorporated in equation (4), it becomes,

$W_{it} = \sum_i$ Badger State t $W_i, t - 1 \, P_{ii} + U_{it}$ (5)

or in matrix type it is written as,

$Y_j = X_j P_j + U_j$ (6)

Where, Yj = (T * 1) vectors of observations reflecting the proportions in cropping pattern j in time t, Xj = (T * r) matrix of realized values of the proportions in cropping pattern in time t – 1, Pj = (r * 1) vectors of unknown transition parameters to be estimated and Uj = vectors of random disturbances. The data from the period 1966-67 to 2016-17 were collected and compiled from the various reports published by Bureau of Economics and Statistics, Directorates of Economics and Statistics, Government of Telangana, and analyzed for five different periods Viz; Period-I (1966-67 to 1974-75), Period-II (1975-76 to 1984-85), Period-III (1985-86 to 1994-95), Period-IV (1995-96 to 2004-05), period-V (2005-06 to 2016-17) and further the analysis was also carried out for every five years for the last decade it includes period-VA (2005-06 to 2010-11) and period-VB (2011-12 to 2016-17) by using Markov chain analysis technique. The rationale behind dividing study period into blocks of ten years was to know the change in

crops from 1966-67 to 2016-17 and for the last decade, the analysis was carried out for every five years considering the agricultural census conducted at an interval of five. While to analyze the data by grouping the crops into various categories becomes the whole task too bulky and difficult.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The stability of the acreage share of the crop and their direction of change over some time was captured by the transition probability matrix. As the diagonal elements approach zero, the crops become less and less stable and as they approach one, they become more and more stable over some time. The elements in the ith row (Tables 1-3) give the proportions of the previous period's acreage of ith crop which is likely to lose to other crops in the current period. The element of ith column gives the proportion of the area of ith crop which is likely to gain in the current period.

Table 1. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - I
(1966-67 to 1974-75)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.872	0.000	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.002
Pulses	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Oilseeds	0.400	0.160	0.409	0.020	0.006	0.006
Commercial crops	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Vegetables	0.000	0.000	0.937	0.063	0.000	0.000
Fruits	0.000	0.000	0.149	0.306	0.218	0.327

Table 2. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - II
(1975-76 to 1984-85)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.911	0.029	0.059	0.000	0.000	0.001
Pulses	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Oilseeds	0.464	0.000	0.465	0.000	0.025	0.045
Commercial crops	0.000	0.000	0.229	0.421	0.000	0.349
Vegetables	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.990	0.000	0.000
Fruits	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 3. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - III
(1985-86 to 1994-95)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.914	0.005	0.077	0.000	0.003	0.001
Pulses	0.365	0.635	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Oilseeds	0.000	0.000	0.718	0.242	0.020	0.020
Commercial crops	0.540	0.000	0.000	0.460	0.000	0.000
Vegetables	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.000	0.346	0.585
Fruits	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.425	0.000	0.569

Table 4. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - IV
(1995- 96 to 2004-05)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.860	0.007	0.034	0.071	0.013	0.015
Pulses	0.000	0.569	0.000	0.117	0.052	0.263
Oilseeds	0.017	0.000	0.468	0.469	0.023	0.023
Commercial crops	0.620	0.000	0.000	0.346	0.004	0.030
Vegetables	0.000	0.239	0.000	0.761	0.000	0.000
Fruits	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 5. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - V (2006-07 to -2016-17)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.688	0.006	0.034	0.223	0.010	0.038
Pulses	0.974	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.026	0.000
Oilseeds	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Commercial crops	0.458	0.010	0.000	0.515	0.000	0.017
Vegetables	0.376	0.394	0.000	0.000	0.230	0.000
Fruits	0.731	0.000	0.197	0.000	0.071	0.000

Table 6. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - VA (2006-07 to 2010-2011)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.694	0.015	0.039	0.199	0.013	0.039
Pulses	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Oilseeds	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Commercial crops	0.392	0.018	0.013	0.545	0.016	0.016
Vegetables	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Fruits	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 7. Transitional Probability Matrix (TPM) for shift in cropping pattern for Period - VB (2011-12 to 2016-17)

Crops	Cereals	Pulses	Oilseeds	Commercial crops	Vegetables	Fruits
Cereals	0.454	0.002	0.000	0.511	0.004	0.029
Pulses	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Oilseeds	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Commercial crops	0.948	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.010
Vegetables	0.570	0.000	0.430	0.000	0.000	0.000
Fruits	0.146	0.057	0.580	0.000	0.000	0.217

4. CONCLUSIONS

The results indicate that 45.4% of cereals area was retained and the remaining area was replaced by commercial crops to an extent of 51.1% and 0.29% by fruit crops and 0.04% by vegetables for the period 2012 to 2017 which indicates the growing trend of commercial crops in Karimnagar district of NTZ. The cereals area was observed to be decreased over the years and it was replaced by commercial crops like cotton and turmeric indicated that the cropping pattern moves towards diversification in Karimnagar district of NTZ. Hence, there is greater scope for decision making in the selection of crops to put the agriculture on the pedestal of sustainable growth which needs to be considered in research and extension programmes.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Kamraju M, Vani M, Anuradha T. Crop diversification pattern: A case study of Telangana State. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology. 2017;2(5):366–371.
2. Agarwal PK, Yadav P, Mondal S. Economic analysis of cost and return structure of paddy cultivation under traditional and SRI Method: A comparative study. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences. 2018;10(80):5890-5893.
3. Churpal D, Koshta AK, Choudhary VK. An economic analysis of rice cultivation and constraint in Dhamtari district of Chhattisgarh, India. Plant Archives. 2015; 15(2):651656.
4. Devi K. Sita, Ponnarasi T. An economic analysis of modern rice production technology and its adoption behavior in TamilNadu. Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2019;22 (Conference Number):341-347.

5. Kumar A, Singh RKP, Singh KM, Mishra JS. Economics of paddy (*Oryza sativa*) production: A comparative study of Bihar and Punjab. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2018;88(2): 314–319.

6. Lakra N, Gauraha AK, Banafar KNS. Economic analysis of production, marketing and constraints of paddy in Dantewada District of Chhattisgarh, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017; 4(2017):108-115.

7. Prakash Satya, Singh Bhim. Economics and constraints analysis of rice production in Jhansi district of Uttar Pradesh, India. Plant Archives. 2013;13(2):865-869.

8. Pravallika KVSD, Prasanna P. A. Lakshmi, Choudhary VK. Economics of paddy cultivation in East Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh. Journal of Rice Research. 2018;10(2):89-96.

9. Pal Govind, Radhika C, Udaya Bhaskar K, Ram H, Prasad S. Rajendra. A study on comparative economics of grain and seed production of ground nut in Karnataka, India. Journal of Experimental Agriculture International. 2016a;14(5):1-9.

10. Pal Govind, Radhika C, Singh RK, Udaya Bhaskar K, Ram H, Prasad S. Rajendra. An economic analysis of pigeon pea seed production technology and its adoption behavior: Indian context. The Scientific World Journal. 2016b;1-7.

11. Lee JC, Judge GG, Takagama T. On estimating the transitional probabilities of Markov process. Journal of Farm Economics. 1965;47(3):742-762.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/53306