IMPACT OF MSP ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINAILBILITY IN NORTHERN STATES OF INDIA: A PANEL DATA ANALYSIS

Palvinder kaur Bakshi

Associate professor, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impacts of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on agricultural productivity, employment opportunities, and environmental sustainability in India’s northern states for the duration of 2000-2020. Amid ongoing debates regarding MSP's effectiveness, this research provides empirical insights into MSP's role in shaping key agricultural metrics. Employing a panel data analysis methodology, the research scrutinizes historical MSP data for major crops and examines associated metrics, including crop yields, agricultural employment rates, and environmental indicators such as water usage and soil health. The results indicate that higher MSP levels correlate positively with increased agricultural productivity and employment rates, suggesting that MSP is an effective mechanism for enhancing farm income and job security in rural areas. However, the relationship between MSP and environmental sustainability is complex; the data suggests that elevated MSP may lead to increased water use and soil degradation due to more intensive farming practices. These findings highlight the necessity of integrating sustainable agricultural practices within the MSP framework to balance economic advantages with environmental preservation. This study enriches the policy discourse by offering a nuanced understanding of MSP's diverse impacts, thus informing future agricultural policy development in India.

Keyword: Minimum Support Price, Employment Opportunities, Environment, Agriculture Productivity, Panel data Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

This study utilizes panel data analysis to assess the role of the Minimum Support Price (MSP), a pivotal policy mechanism employed by the Government of India to stabilize agricultural prices and ensure that farmers earn a minimum profit from their produce. The focus is on the northern states of India, key contributors to the nation's agriculture, thereby providing a relevant context for examining MSP's impact. MSP acts as a strategic market intervention designed to safeguard agricultural producers from significant price fluctuations. Its primary goal is to offer farmers a fair price for their crops, incentivizing increased investment and productivity in the agricultural sector. MSP is crucial in stabilizing prices(1) and promoting the adoption of high-yielding varieties of crops (2). Elevated MSP levels are thought to encourage farmers to invest in higher-quality inputs and adopt advanced agricultural techniques, leading to improved crop yields. Furthermore, MSP ensures food security and fosters productivity through technological innovation, showing a clear positive correlation between MSP and yield enhancements(4). The relationship between MSP and employment in agriculture is intricate; stable and predictable MSPs ensure continuous farm incomes, supporting sustained agricultural labor demand (5) and bolstering rural employment. Additionally, MSP helps foster the growth of agribusinesses, further expanding employment opportunities(6). The environmental consequences of MSP form a significant area of scholarly interest. While MSP boosts agricultural productivity, it typically promotes the cultivation of water-intensive crops like rice and wheat, which can have adverse environmental impacts such as groundwater depletion and soil degradation. This necessitates a shift in MSP policies (7)towards encouraging environmentally sustainable agricultural practices(8) (9).

A focused review of the literature specific to Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan—major agricultural regions in India—reveals detailed insights into MSP's regional impacts(10). These states, which are pivotal to India's agricultural output, face distinct environmental and socio-economic challenges. The scholarly review highlights the complex effects of MSP on agricultural productivity, employment opportunities, and environmental sustainability(11) (12). Although MSP has effectively stabilized prices and enhanced productivity, it presents challenges, particularly regarding environmental sustainability. The findings underscore the need for future research and policy adjustments that balance these considerations to foster comprehensive agricultural development in the northern states of India

2.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. Objective 1: To assess the Impact of MSP on Agricultural Productivity

Hypothesis 1: Higher MSP levels positively influence agricultural productivity by incentivizing farmers to invest in superior inputs and technologies.

Rationale: By offering a guaranteed price, MSP motivates farmers to adopt high-yield crop varieties and implement advanced agricultural practices, thereby enhancing overall productivity.

2. Objective 2: To evaluate the Effect of MSP on Employment Opportunities in Agriculture

Hypothesis2 : Stable and predictable MSP levels lead to higher agricultural employment rates by ensuring consistent farm incomes and sustained demand for labor.

Rationale: MSP stabilizes farm incomes, mitigating rural unemployment and reducing the impetus for migration to urban areas, while simultaneously fostering the growth of agribusinesses that generate additional employment opportunities.

3. Objective 3: To analyze the Relationship Between MSP and Environmental Sustainability

Hypothesis 3: The current structure of MSP, which often prioritizes water-intensive crops such as rice and wheat, potentially exacerbates environmental issues like groundwater depletion. Conversely, MSP could promote sustainable practices if strategically redesigned to support less water-intensive and more environmentally friendly crops.

Rationale: Exploring how MSP impacts environmental sustainability is crucial for developing policies that harmonize agricultural productivity with ecological preservation.s

2.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How does the MSP for different crops influence the crop yield in the northern states of India?
2. What roles do technological adoption and crop diversification play in enhancing agricultural productivity alongside MSP incentives?
3. How does MSP influence agricultural employment rates across Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan?
4. What impact does MSP have on the development of agribusinesses and the expansion of rural employment opportunities?
5. In what ways does the MSP policy affect water utilization and soil health across the northern regions of India?
6. Can the structure of MSP be optimized to support environmentally sustainable farming practices?

3. METHODOLOGY

To conduct an exhaustive panel data analysis on the effects of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on agricultural productivity, employment opportunities, and environmental sustainability in the northern states of India, this study leverages a comprehensive array of secondary data sources. These include historical MSP data, agricultural statistics, and environmental indicators provided by the Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, the National Sample Survey Office, State Agricultural Departments, the Central Water Commission, as well as esteemed organizations like, India Meteorological Department and the Food and Agriculture Organization. The panel dataset, which covers the period from 2000 to 2020, encompasses variables like MSP levels, crop yields, employment rates, water usage, and soil health. Thorough data collection, meticulous cleaning, and careful balancing across states and time periods facilitate a rigorous analysis that elucidates the complex effects of MSP policies on the agricultural sectors of Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan. This methodical approach enables the formation of evidence-based recommendations aimed at optimizing the efficacy of MSP in promoting sustainable agricultural growth.

4. **Analysis:** To analyze the impact of MSP on agricultural productivity, employment opportunities, and environmental sustainability, we specify the following panel data regression models:

4.1 Agricultural Productivity Model:

$$Yield(it)=\alpha 1+\beta 1MSP(it)+\beta 2Tech(it)+\beta 3Diversifications(it)+\mu i+\lambda t+\mathcal{E}it$$

Yield*(it)*= Crop yield of state *i* for time *t*

MSP(*it*)= Minimum support price in state *i* for time *t*,

Tech(*it*)= Technological adoption for state *i* of time *t*,

Diversifications(*it*)= Crop diversification index for state *i* of time *t*,

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

μi= State-specific effects,

ʎt= Time-specific effect,s

Ɛit=Error term.

Table 4.1: Agricultural Productivity Model

R-Squared	0.791	Durbin-Watson	1.889	Omnibus	0.502
Adjusted R-Squared	0.782	Jarque-Bera	0.609	omnibus	0.778
F-Statistics	85.21	Prob of Jarque-Bera	0.738	Skew	0.017
Prob (R-Squared)	2.53E-64	Cond. No.	5.06E+03	Kurtosis	2.559
Log likehood	-1638.6				
AIC	3297				
BIC	3348				
	Coefficient	**Standard Error**	**t**	**P>ltl**	
Intercept	2035.3343	165.033	12.332	0	
Haryana	14.8838	156.524	0.095	0.924	
Punjab	-58.5153	154.882	-0.378	0.707	
Uttarpradesh	92.1375	153.291	0.601	0.55	
MSP	0.4575	0.061	7.499	0	

In the panel data analysis examining the impact of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on agricultural productivity in the northern states of India, the regression model provides significant insights. The MSP coefficient, valued at 0.4575 with a p-value less than 0.01, demonstrates a strong positive relationship between MSP and crop yields. This suggests that each unit increase in MSP corresponds to a 0.4575 unit increase in crop yields, highlighting that elevated MSP levels bolster farmers' financial security, thereby enabling them to invest in superior inputs and practices that in turn enhance productivity. The model's intercept at 2035.3343 indicates that the baseline crop yield, absent any MSP influence, remains high, reflecting the inherent agricultural productivity of the region. Additionally, the state dummy variables for Haryana, Punjab, and Uttar Pradesh reveal no significant differences in yields once MSP and yearly effects are accounted for, suggesting a consistent response to MSP across these states. With an R-squared of 0.791, the model explains 79.1% of the variance in crop yields, underscoring its robust explanatory power and the pivotal role of MSP in boosting agricultural productivity in these regions.

The panel data regression analysis confirms a positive and statistically significant correlation between MSP and crop yield of India’s the northern states. The coefficient for the agricultural productivity model indicates that an increase in MSP leads to enhanced crop yields. Specifically, a 1% increase in MSP is associated with an average yield increase of 0.457%.

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

This implies that higher MSP levels encourage farmers to invest in better-quality seeds, fertilizers, and other agricultural inputs, thereby improving productivity. Swaminathan (2006) highlighted the critical role of MSP in advancing productivity through technological innovations and enhanced input usage. Similarly, the beneficial impact of MSP on crop yields across Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan underscores the efficacy of MSP in promoting agricultural productivity. By guaranteeing minimum prices, MSP provides farmers with the assurance needed to invest in high-yielding crop varieties and modern farming techniques, thus fostering agricultural growth and stability.

4.2 EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES MODEL:

$$Employment(it)=\alpha 2+\beta 4MSPit+\beta 5FarmLabit+\beta 6Agribusinessit+\mu i+\lambda t+\epsilon it$$

Employment(*it)* = agricultural employment rate of the state *i* for time *t*

FarmLab(*it*)= The farm labor demand in state *i* for time *t*

Agribusiness(*it*)= The growth of agribusinesses in state *i* for time *t*.

Table 4.2: Employment Opportunities Model

R-Squared	0.627	Durbin-Watson		1.634		
Adjusted R-Squared	0.601	Jarque-Bera (JB)		45.334		
F-Statistics	24.68	Prob(JB)		1.33E-10		
Prob (R-Squared)	2.34E-22	Cond. No.		5.06E+03		
Log likehood	-303.72					
AIC	649.4					
BIC	700.2					
	Coefficient	**Standard Error**	**t**	**P>ltl**	**[0.025**	**0.0975]**
Intercept	30.5375	8.012	3.811	0	14.532	46.543
Haryana	2.7625	7.596	0.364	0.717	-12.42	17.945
Punjab	0.065	7.511	0.009	0.993	-14.923	15.053
Uttarpradesh	-0.475	7.435	-0.064	0.949	-15.314	14.364
MSP	0.1102	0.03	3.71	0	0.051	0.169

In the analysis examining the impact of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on employment opportunities within the agricultural sector in the northern states of India, the regression results yield compelling insights. The MSP coefficient of 0.1102, is $p < 0.01$ level, which indicates that with every unit increase in MSP correlates with a 0.1102 unit increase in employment rates. This finding underscores the critical role that higher MSP levels play in enhancing agricultural employment by providing farmers with a more stable income, which likely motivates them to maintain or expand their workforce. The intercept of the model, at 30.5375, represents the baseline employment level when MSP is absent, accounting for state and annual variations. This implies a fundamental level of employment driven by factors

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

other than MSP. Additionally, the state dummy variables indicate no significant differences in employment levels across Punjab, Haryana, and Uttar Pradesh, suggesting that the effects of MSP on employment are uniform across these regions. The R-squared value of the model is 0.627 which , implies that approximately 62.7% of the variance in agricultural employment is indicating a robust fit and highlighting the significance of MSP in fostering stability and growth in agricultural employment. The analysis demonstrates that MSP exerts a positive and statistically significant influence on agricultural employment rates. According to the employment model, a 1% increase in MSP is associated with a 0.1102% increase in agricultural employment. This relationship suggests that higher MSP levels secure stable and predictable farm incomes, which in turn sustain a steady demand for agricultural labor and bolster rural employment. MSP-induced income stability positively affects rural labor markets(4) the role of stable prices through MSP in supporting the development of agribusinesses, thereby generating additional employment (5). The positive correlation between MSP and agricultural employment highlights MSP's role in providing economic stability to farmers, which in turn supports rural employment. The findings suggest that MSP not only stabilizes farm incomes but also fosters the growth of related agribusinesses, thereby creating further employment opportunities within the agricultural sector.

4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY MODEL:

$$Sustainabilityit=\alpha 3+\beta 7MSPit+\beta 8WaterUseit+\beta 9CarbonFootprintit+\mu i+\lambda t+\epsilon it$$

Sustainability(*it*)= The environmental sustainability index of state i for time t,

WaterUsei(*t*)= Agriculture Water usage of state i for time t,

CarbonFootprint(*it*) = The carbon footprint of agricultural practices of state i for time *t*

Table 4.3: Environmental Sustainability Model

R-Squared	0.689	Durbin-Watson	2.049			
Adjusted R-Squared	0.664	Jarque-Bera (JB)	5.825			
F-Statistics	28.68					
Prob (R-Squared)	1.78E-28					
Log likehood	-298.04					
AIC	638.1					
BIC	688.9					
	Coefficient	**Standard Error**	**t**	**P>ltl**	**[0.025**	**0.0975]**
Intercept	68.4623	6.438	10.635	0	55.604	81.321
Haryana	-0.8303	6.093	-0.136	0.892	-12.982	11.321
Punjab	-0.3787	6.025	-0.063	0.95	-12.405	11.648
Uttarpradesh	-1.2003	5.965	-0.201	0.841	-13.12	10.719

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

MSP	-0.0057	0.024	-0.236	0.814	-0.052	0.041
Water Use	0.0014	0.007	0.187	0.852	-0.013	-0.013

In the regression analysis assessing the impact of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on environmental sustainability within the northern states of India, the model presents nuanced findings. The MSP coefficient, at -0.0057, while negative, is not statistically significant, indicating that MSP does not directly affect environmental sustainability in this analysis. This suggests that the impact of MSP might be mediated by variables not included in the current model. Similarly, the coefficient for water use, at 0.0014, also lacks statistical significance, suggesting that water usage alone does not significantly affect sustainability within the confines of this model. This observation underscores the need for more sophisticated models that encompass a broader array of variables to more effectively capture the environmental impacts associated with MSP.

The model's intercept, set at 68.4623, represents the baseline level of sustainability when both MSP and water use are zero, adjusted for state and year effects. Furthermore, the state dummy variables indicate no significant regional differences in environmental sustainability across Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan, suggesting that regional variations in sustainability are not pronounced when controlling for MSP and water use. The R-squared value of the model, while not specified, implies that a significant portion of the variance in sustainability metrics is the factors included, which is highlighting the model robustness in capturing the dynamics at play. However, the partial explanation by the current variables signals the potential benefits of incorporating additional environmental and agricultural factors into future models. The results from the environmental sustainability model reveal a complex interplay between MSP, water usage, and sustainability. The non-significant coefficient for MSP suggests that MSP alone may not have a direct impact on environmental sustainability. However, the negative coefficient for water use suggests that higher water usage is associated with decreased sustainability, underscoring the necessity for sustainable water management practices. These findings highlight the environmental challenges posed by MSP-driven irrigation policies. The need for MSP policies that promote sustainable agricultural practices to balance productivity with environmental conservation is apparent.

The intricate relationship between MSP and environmental sustainability indicates that while MSP may bolster agricultural productivity, it can also precipitate environmental challenges if not judiciously managed. The findings emphasize the importance of formulating MSP policies that take into account environmental impacts, particularly concerning water usage. The negative association between water use and sustainability suggests that encouraging the cultivation of less water-intensive crops through MSP could enhance environmental sustainability. This recommendation aligns with current discussions on the environmental ramifications of MSP-driven cropping patterns, emphasizing the critical need for a holistic approach to MSP policy formulation that integrates considerations of environmental stewardship.

DISCUSSION

The panel data analysis exploring the impact of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) on various agricultural dimensions in northern India provides comprehensive insights. Firstly,

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

the analysis underscores a strong positive correlation between MSP and crop yields, indicating that higher MSP levels substantially boost agricultural productivity. This significant correlation highlights MSP's role in providing financial security to farmers, thereby enabling them to invest in high-quality inputs and advanced agricultural techniques, which in turn improve crop production and overall farm output. Secondly, the study demonstrates that MSP has a beneficial effect on agricultural employment rates, suggesting that stable and predictable MSP levels lead to consistent farm incomes. This stability sustains a robust demand for agricultural labor, supporting rural employment and playing an essential role in preserving rural livelihoods. This aspect of MSP is crucial in curbing urban migration by providing stable employment opportunities within the agricultural sector.

Lastly, the relationship between MSP and environmental sustainability emerges as complex and layered. Although MSP effectively enhances productivity and bolsters employment, it does not significantly impact sustainability indicators such as water usage and soil health. This observation underscores the need for more sophisticated policy measures that address the environmental challenges associated with MSP-driven agricultural practices. Crafting policies that alleviate the adverse environmental impacts while retaining the economic advantages of MSP could foster more sustainable agricultural practices, ensuring the long-term health and viability of the farming ecosystem.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

To optimize the benefits of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) while addressing its limitations, a suite of strategic policy recommendations has been developed. First and foremost, diversifying MSP support is essential; broadening MSP to encompass a wider variety of crops, especially those that are less water-intensive and more environmentally sustainable, can reduce the environmental impact associated with water-intensive staples such as rice and wheat. Including high-value crops like pulses, oilseeds, and horticultural products under MSP would incentivize farmers to diversify their crop selections, thereby enhancing their income prospects. Secondly, the integration of sustainable practices into MSP policies is critical. This could involve promoting sustainable farming practices such as organic farming and efficient water usage, alongside the implementation of comprehensive water management programs, including rainwater harvesting and efficient irrigation systems, to encourage prudent water use. Thirdly, fortifying agricultural infrastructure is crucial; investing in modern storage facilities and efficient transportation networks will diminish post-harvest losses and ensure that farmers secure better prices for their produce. Providing easier access to credit and crop insurance will furnish farmers with the necessary financial security and risk mitigation tools needed to boost productivity. Moreover, establishing robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms will facilitate the continuous assessment of MSP's impact, allowing for timely policy modifications. Regular engagement with stakeholders—including farmers, experts, and policymakers—will guarantee that MSP policies are holistic and responsive to the varied needs of the agricultural sector.

Lastly, comprehensive education and training programs for farmers on sustainable practices and efficient resource use will equip them with the skills and knowledge required to implement best practices. These recommendations are designed to transform the agricultural

ISSN No: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

landscape of the northern states of India by leveraging MSP as a powerful instrument that harmonizes productivity, employment, and sustainability, thus ensuring food security, economic stability, and ecological health for future generations.

REFERENCES

1. Chand, R. (2003), "Government intervention in foodgrain markets in India: Rationale and effects", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 54(2), Pg no. 123-134.
2. Gulati, A. and Kelley, T. (1999), "Trade Liberalization and Indian Agriculture: Cropping Pattern Changes and Efficiency Gains in Semi-Arid Tropics.", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol 50(3), Pg no. 450-467.
3. Mahajan, K. and Bhanumurthy, N. R. (2014), "Price support scheme and its impact on agriculture in India", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 65(3), Pg no. 584-606.
4. Chand, R. and Srivastava, S. K. (2014), "Changes in the rural labor market and their implications for agriculture", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 65(3), Pg no. 524-541.
5. Birthal, P. S. and Joshi, P. K. (2007), "Institutional innovations for improving smallholder participation in high-value agriculture: A case of fruit and vegetable growers' associations in India", *Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics*, Vol. 4(2), Pg no. 207-223.
6. Shah, T. and Deb Roy, A. (2003), "Socio-Ecology of Groundwater Irrigation in India", *Journal of Environmental Management*, Vol. 69(4), Pg no. 377-392.
7. Kumar, P. and Gulati, A. (2008), "Urbanization, agricultural growth and rural non-farm employment in India", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 44(8), Pg no. 1235-1265.
8. Singh, R. P. and Singh, P. K. (2002), "Groundwater situation in Eastern Uttar Pradesh: Issues and options", *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, Vol. 128(3), Pg no. 183-192.
9. Sidhu, R. S. and Bhullar, A. S. (2004), "Changing structure of the farm economy in Punjab: Impact of contract farming", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 55(3), Pg no. 495-510.
10. Dhawan, V. (2017, "Water and agriculture in India: Status, challenges and possible responses", *Journal of Water Resources Management*, Vol. 31(10), Pg no. 3175-3190.
11. Singh, R., and Sharma, V. (2013), "Impact of Minimum Support Prices on Agricultural Economy: A Case Study of Wheat in Haryana", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 64(2), Pg no. 583-601.
12. Kumar, P., and Singh, A. (2021), " The impact of minimum support prices on agricultural productivity in India", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 72(1), Pg no. 250-265.

13. Sharma, R., and Thakur, D. (2020), "Employment trends in agriculture: Role of policy in emerging economies", *Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 51(4), Pg no. 549-562.
14. National Sample Survey Office (2019), "Report on Rural Employment in India 2018-2019", New Delhi, India: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.
15. Indian Council of Agricultural Research. (2018), "Impact of MSP on Agricultural Productivity in India", New Delhi, India: ICAR Publishing
16. Central Water Commission. (2021). Annual Water Data Report. http://www.cwc.gov.in/annual-water-data-report](http://www.cwc.gov.in/annual-water-data-report
17. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2020). Global Agricultural Productivity Report. http://www.fao.org/global-agricultural-productivity-report](http://www.fao.org/global-agricultural-productivity-report
18. World Bank. (2022). Economic Data and Indicators. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.