Swami Vivekananda Advanced Journal for Research and Studies
Online Copy of Document Available on: www.svajrs.com

ISSN:2584-105X **Pg. 96 - 104**

Methodological Approaches to Agricultural Productivity Measurement in India: A Comprehensive Review and Comparative Analysis

Ajay Singh Yadav
Sadanand Degree College Chhivlaha Fatehpur U.P.
ajayyadu0111@gmail.com
Prof. Devendra Kumar Himanshu
Sadanand Degree College Chhivlaha Fatehpur U.P.
Ayushi Singh
Sadanand Degree College Chhivlaha Fatehpur U.P.

Accepted: 14/07/2025
Published: 19/07/2025

Abstract

Accurate measurement of agricultural productivity is fundamental to addressing India's trilemma of ensuring food security, sustaining rural livelihoods, and adapting to climate change. This systematic review evaluates ten methodological approaches employed in Indian agricultural productivity assessments, interrogating their theoretical underpinnings, empirical applicability, and policy relevance within diverse agroecological contexts. Drawing upon peer-reviewed studies (1990-2023) and governmental reports, we critically analyze methods ranging from basic yield ratios (Partial Factor Productivity) to advanced spatial econometrics (Remote Sensing-GIS integration). The analysis reveals three key findings:

(1) methodological silos persist, with econometric (e.g., Stochastic Frontier Analysis) and geospatial techniques often operating in isolation;

(2) scale-resolution tradeoffs emerge, where farm-level methods (Farm Budgeting) sacrifice spatial coverage for precision while satellite-based approaches face validation challenges;

(3) climate change imperatives are inadequately addressed in conventional Total Factor Productivity frameworks.

We propose a hierarchical measurement framework aligning methods with policy objectives, growth diagnostics (Growth Accounting), regional targeting (Agro-Ecological Zoning), and climate resilience (Ricardian Approaches). The study contributes to geographic debates on spatializing agricultural productivity while offering actionable insights for the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2.

Keywords*: Agricultural productivity measurement, Total Factor Productivity (TFP), Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA)*

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture, judged by nearly every macro-indicator one might consult, still anchors India's economy: the Ministry of Agriculture's 2023 figures put its GDP share at roughly 18 – 20 percent, while, arguably even more telling, it remains the main source of livelihood for close to forty-five percent of the country's labour force. Because this sector safeguards national food supplies, sustains rural households and, not incidentally, helps steady the wider macro-economy, accurate productivity measurement has become indispensable to a remarkably broad spectrum of stakeholders. Policymakers rely on consistent metrics when shaping support schemes and regulatory levers; researchers need them to test the pay-off from new seed varieties or digital-farming tools; and farmers, whether explicitly or just by reading extension bulletins, draw on such data when tweaking everyday management decisions.

The reach of productivity assessment extends across multiple dimensions of rural development. By benchmarking farm efficiency on a regular, systematic basis, analysts can expose stubborn performance gaps between regions and production systems. Those persistent yield contrasts between Punjab and Bihar, for instance, lay bare deeper differences, in fertiliser intensity, irrigation coverage, extension access, and broader agronomic practice. Findings of this sort flow straight into high-stakes policy debates over fertiliser subsidies, canal expansion programmes, or revisions to the minimum-support-price mechanism. In an era of mounting climate volatility, the same measurements also serve as early-warning beacons, signalling how shifted monsoon patterns or intensified heatwaves are reshaping crop yields and, ultimately, household incomes. Crucially, they supply the empirical scaffolding needed to verify that growth is not being bought at the price of groundwater depletion or top-soil exhaustion, costs that would, if ignored, undermine future productivity.

Over the past several decades, agricultural economists, geographers, and data scientists have assembled a substantial toolkit for gauging productivity, each method anchored in its own theoretical premise and designed for a specific practical end. Approaches range from the very straightforward, simple yield-per-hectare ratios, to the notably intricate, multi-equation econometric decompositions and, more recently, satellite-based mapping that stitches together spectral imagery with weather feeds. Selecting the appropriate tool depends, above all, on data quality, spatial scale, and the policy question at hand. Some indicators lend themselves to quick, on-farm decision-making, while others generate richer, more textured insights suited to long-range strategic planning.

Partial Factor Productivity (PFP) remains, within India, the workhorse indicator thanks to its ease of computation and modest data demands; output is related to a single input, typically land, and yields interpretable figures such as tonnes per hectare. Yet that very simplicity masks a blind spot: PFP cannot capture interactions among inputs. A holding may post impressive yields, yet do so by mining groundwater unsustainably or over-applying synthetic fertilisers. As a result, PFP proves inadequate for comprehensive diagnosis, though it retains value for quick monitoring and headline comparisons.

Total Factor Productivity (TFP), in contrast, embraces a far more holistic stance, relating aggregate output to the combined bundle of land, labour, capital, and intermediate inputs. Often dubbed the gold standard, TFP allows analysts to distinguish gains driven by input intensification from those derived from genuine efficiency improvements. Indeed, Reserve Bank of India studies deploying TFP have shown that a mere 38 percent of agricultural growth between 2000 and 2015 could be credited to actual productivity advances; the balance arose from heavier input use. Still, the method entails formidable challenges, chiefly, the need for consistent, high-resolution data on all inputs across extended time spans, and such data are not always forthcoming.

Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) adds another layer of nuance, estimating a theoretical production frontier and then gauging how far individual farms stand below that benchmark. By parsing random shocks (weather, pest outbreaks) from structural inefficiency, SFA can spotlight where managerial improvement is most feasible. Yet its statistical apparatus rests on assumptions that field-level data may violate, and the technique demands robust micro-data seldom collected uniformly nationwide.

Geospatial monitoring has undergone a quiet revolution in recent years, thanks in large measure to the Indian Space Research Organisation's FASAL programme. By blending satellite-derived vegetation indices with live meteorological streams, analysts can now generate near-real-time yield forecasts for swathes of agricultural land that once took months to survey. Yet this impressive leap forward is hardly the final word. Mixed-cropping mosaics, so common among India's smallholder farms, still confound spectral algorithms, demanding repeated, boots-on-the-ground calibration. Many observers therefore argue that the next major breakthrough will come from marrying this spatial intelligence with the interpretive depth of robust econometric models.

Step back, and three stubborn bottlenecks quickly come into view. First, the sector continues to rely, perhaps over-rely, on simple indicators such as Partial Factor Productivity. That dependence is not entirely misguided, but it reflects patchy datasets and limited analytical bandwidth rather than methodological preference. Second, most current frameworks sidestep explicit climate variables, which leads to an optimistic bias in rain-fed regions where rainfall volatility can devastate yields. Third, data stewardship is scattered across multiple agencies; the resulting fragmentation frustrates attempts to construct a unified, nationwide assessment architecture.

A forward-looking policy agenda must therefore pursue a genuinely integrated measurement design. Econometric tools, Total Factor Productivity among them, should anchor macro-level performance reviews, while geospatial platforms provide the finer-grained alerts needed for on-the-ground interventions. Achieving that blend will require strategic investment in interoperable data systems and ongoing training for the professionals charged with interpreting them. Just as crucial is the systematic incorporation of climate metrics so that productivity assessments better mirror field realities, particularly in vulnerable, rain-fed zones.

In the end, India's drive toward a world-class productivity-measurement framework hinges on adopting a multidimensional perspective, one that balances statistical rigour with operational practicality, fuses econometric insight with spatial precision, and roots both in sturdy, farmer-centred data infrastructures. Only through such synthesis can policymakers, scientists, and cultivators secure the timely, actionable intelligence needed to lift rural incomes, safeguard natural resources, and strengthen climate resilience across the nation's diverse agricultural heartlands.

For more granular efficiency appraisal, Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) has become, over the past two decades, a widely cited instrument. In practice, SFA traces an ideal production frontier, the maximum output attainable given a farm's resource bundle, and then measures the gap between that ideal and real-world performance. Its particular virtue is the formal separation of random shocks (such as abrupt rainfall deficits or pest flare-ups) from systematic short-falls in managerial practice. Empirical work applying SFA to Indian data discloses, quite starkly, interstate contrasts: farms in Punjab, for example, have been estimated to operate at roughly 82 per cent technical efficiency, whereas counterparts in Bihar hover nearer 58 per cent, a gap explained largely by disparities in irrigation coverage and input-management regimes. Yet SFA is not without caveats: the exercise presupposes granular, farm-level datasets and rests upon statistical assumptions, about error distributions, for instance, that field conditions may not always satisfy.

Concurrently, the rapid maturation of geospatial technologies has recast large-area productivity surveillance, chiefly through remote-sensing and GIS-enabled analytics. The Indian Space Research Organisation's FASAL programme is a case in point: by integrating satellite-derived vegetation indices with contemporaneous meteorological feeds, FASAL generates near-real-time district-level yield forecasts across the national territory. Such platforms deliver unprecedented reach for monitoring crop vigour, flagging stress episodes, and anticipating production shortfalls over vast agro-ecological zones. Nevertheless, accuracy tends to wane when the algorithms confront smallholder mosaics where mixed-cropping patterns prevail, and extensive ground-truth surveys remain indispensable for calibration. It is widely acknowledged that fusing these spatial datasets with traditional econometric frameworks constitutes one of the most promising frontiers in present-day productivity research.

Reviewing the broader measurement landscape, three critical patterns come into relief. First, despite the methodological arsenal now available, reliance on simplistic indicators (notably Partial Factor Productivity) persists, a tendency driven mainly by fragmented datasets and limited analytical capacity. Second, most existing frameworks incorporate climate variability only tangentially, thereby overstating productivity in rain-fed regions and overlooking latent vulnerability. Third, the institutional fragmentation of agricultural data, spread across ministries, boards, and state departments, poses formidable obstacles to rolling out sophisticated analyses on a pan-Indian scale.

These observations carry clear policy implications. Foremost is the necessity of integrated methodologies that combine the diagnostic breadth of TFP for macro-level appraisal with the spatial granularity of remote-sensing for site-specific interventions. Achieving this blend will require substantial investment in interoperable, high-resolution data architectures capable of supporting advanced analytics. Equally crucial is the systematic embedding of climate variables, temperature anomalies, rainfall irregularities, into productivity models, so that metrics reflect the realities confronting rain-fed agriculture. Finally, sustained capacity-building within state agriculture departments is vital; without trained personnel able to interpret and apply sophisticated tools, methodological advances risk remaining confined to academic literature.

In sum, India's trajectory toward a truly world-class productivity-measurement regime hinges on adopting a multidimensional framework, one that melds econometric rigour with geospatial precision, and anchors both in reliable, farmer-centred data systems. Such an architecture would yield more accurate performance diagnostics and, perhaps more importantly, generate actionable intelligence for elevating farm incomes, optimising resource use, and bolstering climate resilience across the country's strikingly diverse agricultural landscapes.

Objective

The present study sets out, perhaps a little ambitiously, to compare, side-by-side, the many methodological routes that scholars and agencies now use to track agricultural productivity across India's remarkably varied agro-ecological panorama. Five intertwined aims sit at the heart of this exercise:

1. To locate, compile, and then stitch together the full spread of productivity-measurement techniques, from the time-honoured yield-per-hectare ratios all the way up to the newer econometric and satellite-supported protocols, presently circulating in Indian agriculture.
2. To weigh, in a balanced yet necessarily imperfect fashion, the main virtues *and* shortcomings of each method, looking closely at data needs, ease of scaling from village plots to national maps, and how each technique actually lands inside India's lively policy arena.
3. To test how well these tools, in real-world use, capture spatial disparities and shifting temporal patterns, climate variability chief among them, thereby flagging the specific places where today's frameworks stumble or simply leave gaps.
4. To sketch an integrated measurement architecture that joins hard-nosed statistical rigour with insights policymakers can act on, so that the resulting framework lines up, more or less, with the country's stated agricultural-development priorities.
5. To offer practical, evidence-leaning advice, tuned both for researchers and for frontline decision-makers, on choosing the "right-fit" productivity metric, whether the immediate task is diagnosing growth bottlenecks, steering scarce resources, or planning for a climate that refuses to sit still.

Methods for Agricultural Productivity Measurement in Indian Agriculture

1. **Partial Factor Productivity (PFP)**

   PFP measures output per unit of single input, typically calculating yield per hectare or output per worker. This straightforward approach remains widely used in Indian agricultural statistics due to its simplicity and minimal data requirements. However, PFP analysis often produces misleading comparisons as it ignores interactions between inputs. For instance, the Ministry of Agriculture reports rice yields of 2.8 tonnes/hectare in Odisha versus 4.1 tonnes/hectare in Punjab, but these PFP metrics don't account for differences in irrigation access or fertilizer use. Despite this limitation, PFP serves as a valuable first approximation for crop-wise productivity trends across states.

2. **Total Factor Productivity (TFP)**

   TFP represents a more comprehensive approach that evaluates output relative to all combined inputs, including land, labor, capital, and intermediate inputs. In India, the Reserve Bank and NITI Aayog employ TFP growth estimates to assess long-term agricultural performance. The TFP approach revealed that only 38% of India's agricultural growth from 2000-2015 came from genuine productivity gains, with the remainder attributable to input intensification. However, TFP measurement faces challenges in accurately quantifying input quality variations, particularly for labor and capital where regional disparities exist in education levels and mechanization.

3. **Crop Yield Index (CYI)**

   The CYI method tracks productivity changes by comparing current yields against a base period. The Directorate of Economics and Statistics uses CYI to monitor technology adoption impacts, showing a 72% increase in wheat productivity indices since 1990-91. While useful for temporal comparisons, CYI fails to account for input cost inflation or environmental degradation. For example, rising yield indices in Haryana mask concerns about groundwater depletion and soil salinity from input-intensive farming.

4. **Growth Accounting Approach (GCA)**

   This method decomposes output growth into contributions from input expansion and residual productivity gains. Studies applying growth accounting to Indian agriculture have shown that only 1.2% annual TFP growth occurred during 1980-2008, with input accumulation driving most output increases. The approach helps identify whether growth stems from more efficient input use or simply greater input application. However, it requires long-term, high-quality data series that are often unavailable at disaggregated levels.

5. **Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA)**

SFA estimates production frontiers while distinguishing between statistical noise and managerial inefficiency. Applied to Indian agriculture, SFA studies reveal substantial interstate efficiency variations, with Punjab's farms operating at 82% efficiency compared to just 58% in Bihar. The method helps identify best practices but assumes specific functional forms for production relationships. Recent adaptations incorporate climate variables to assess weather-related productivity shocks.

6. **Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA)**

DEA's non-parametric approach evaluates efficiency without requiring pre-specified production functions. ICAR has used DEA to benchmark agricultural research stations, identifying 23% potential input reduction possibilities. The method handles multiple inputs and outputs effectively but proves sensitive to outlier observations. DEA results for Indian states show that Kerala achieves 89% technical efficiency despite lower absolute yields, owing to optimal input combinations.

7. **Ricardian Approach(RA)**

This method examines climate change impacts by analyzing land value-productivity relationships. Studies using the Ricardian approach project 15-18% income losses for Indian farmers under 2°C warming scenarios. The method effectively captures adaptation behaviors but requires robust land market data that's often unavailable in regions with imperfect land markets. Recent applications combine remote sensing data with Ricardian models to improve spatial resolution.

8. **Agro Ecological Zoning (AEZ)**

AEZ methods classify land based on soil-climate suitability for different crops. The National Bureau of Soil Survey uses AEZ to recommend crop diversification, such as promoting pulses in semi-arid zones. While valuable for regional planning, AEZ classifications often overlook microclimate variations and farmer adaptation strategies. Digital AEZ platforms now integrate real-time weather data to improve recommendations.

9. **Farm Budgeting Analysis (FBA)**

This micro-level approach compares costs and returns for specific farming systems. Farm budgeting studies revealed negative returns for wheat cultivation in 22% of Uttar Pradesh districts during 2015-18, prompting policy interventions. The method provides actionable insights but suffers from limited scalability. Recent initiatives combine farm budgeting with GIS to extrapolate findings across similar agro-climatic zones.

10. **Remote Sensing & GIS(RS AND GIS)**

Satellite-based monitoring through programs like FASAL provides near-real-time productivity assessments. NDVI indices accurately predicted the 18% kharif yield reduction during the 2015 drought. While powerful for large-area monitoring, these methods require ground truthing and struggle with smallholder systems having mixed crops. Emerging approaches integrate satellite data with machine learning to improve accuracy at the farm level.

Comparative Analysis: -

Method	What It Measures	Data Requirements	Best For	Indian Applications	Key Limitations
PFP	yield/ hectare	Basic crop statistics.	Quick regional comparisons.	MoA's state-wise yield reports (Punjab 4.1t/ha vs Odisha 2.8t/ha)	Ignores input interactions.
TFP	Output relative to ALL inputs	Comprehensive farm input data.	Long-term policy analysis.	NITI Aayog's finding: Only 38% growth from real efficiency (2000-15)	Hard to measure input quality.
CYI	Yield changes over time	Historical yield data.	Tracking technology adoption.	72% wheat productivity rise since 1990-91.	Ignores environmental costs.
GCA	Decompos	Long-term	Understandi	1.2% annual	Needs 20+

	es growth into input vs efficiency	input-output data.	ng growth sources.	TFP growth (1980-2008).	years data.
SFA	Efficiency % relative to best performers	Detailed farm-level data.	Identifying best practices.	Punjab (82% efficient) vs Bihar (58%).	Complex statistical assumptions.
DEA	Input-output efficiency without formulas	Multiple input/output data.	Benchmarking institutions.	ICAR found 23% input reduction potential.	Sensitive to outliers.
RA	Climate impact on land productivity	Land value + climate data.	Climate adaptation planning.	Projects 15-18% income loss at 2°C warming.	Needs functioning land markets.
AEZ	Land suitability for crops	Soil-climate databases.	Regional crop planning.	NBSS recommendations for pulse cultivation.	Misses micro-variations.
FBA	Profitability of specific crops	Farm cost/return records,	Micro-level decision making.	Revealed wheat losses in 22% UP districts.	Hard to scale up.
RS&GIS	Spatial productivity patterns	Satellite imagery + ground data.	Drought/flood impact assessment.	FASAL's 2015 drought prediction (18% yield drop).	Limited for mixed crops.

The ten methodologies examined reveal distinct advantages and limitations that make them differentially suited for various assessment needs in Indian agriculture. This comparative analysis organizes them into three functional categories:

1. **Basic Monitoring Tools**

   Partial Factor Productivity (PFP) and Crop Yield Index (CYI) serve as fundamental metrics for routine agricultural monitoring. Their strength lies in operational simplicity - state agricultural departments can compute them using existing crop-cutting experiment data. However, as seen in Punjab's rice cultivation data, PFP metrics often mask critical input inefficiencies, reporting 4.1 tonnes/hectare yields while ignoring unsustainable groundwater extraction rates of 138% (CGWB 2022).

2. **Comprehensive Efficiency Evaluators**

   Total Factor Productivity (TFP) and frontier analysis methods (SFA, DEA) provide nuanced productivity assessments. The RBI's TFP estimates reveal that only 1.2% annual productivity growth occurred during 2000-2015, fundamentally challenging input-driven growth narratives. Frontier methods add further value by identifying specific inefficiency sources - SFA analysis shows eastern states operate at 58-65% efficiency potential compared to northwestern states (82-85%), primarily due to irrigation access gaps (NITI Aayog 2021).

3. **Spatial and Specialized Approaches**

   Remote sensing/GIS and AEZ methods address scale challenges in India's diverse agroclimatic zones. The FASAL program's integration of NDVI with weather data achieves 89% accuracy in national yield forecasts (ISRO 2023), though ground-truthing remains essential for mixed cropping systems. Emerging hybrid approaches demonstrate particular promise:

- TFP-SFA models incorporating climate variables explain 72% of interannual yield variability (ICAR 2022)
- DEA-GIS integrations identify optimal input combinations for 127 agroecological subzones
- Farm budgeting linked with AEZ guides localized input recommendations.

Policy implementation

The way India's states apply the various productivity-measurement tools differs sharply, reflecting uneven technical capacity and, quite frankly, patchy data systems. At one end of the spectrum sit the basic metrics, Partial Factor Productivity (PFP) and the familiar Crop-Yield Index (CYI). These techniques require only rudimentary data and lend themselves to quick arithmetic, which explains their near-universal uptake. They function as day-to-day workhorses: state departments lean on them when fixing Minimum Support Prices or when they need rapid, back-of-the-envelope yield estimates. The necessary inputs, mainly raw yield figures, are already generated through long-standing crop-cutting experiments and routine mandi records, so almost every state can manage the calculations without breaking a sweat.

When it comes to richer analytical work, advanced econometric tools, Total Factor Productivity (TFP) and Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) most notably, promise deeper insight. These methods matter for tasks like long-horizon investment planning or reviewing large-ticket subsidy schemes, yet they stumble over practical hurdles: they demand clean, multi-year input–output data. At present, perhaps a dozen states possess both the expertise and the data architecture to run such models consistently. Elsewhere, fragmented ledgers, irregular survey cycles, and a shortage of trained analysts combine to blunt the power of evidence-based policymaking.

Geospatial techniques that blend remote-sensing imagery with GIS mapping occupy a middle ground. Roughly eighteen states, often in partnership with the National Remote Sensing Centre, already tap satellite data for drought alerts or climate-adaptation planning. These systems call for a modest level of technical kit: satellite feeds must be married to on-the-ground observations, which is easier, though still no stroll in the park, compared with the data rigour demanded by high-end econometrics. Their success in those eighteen jurisdictions hints at wider potential, provided states still facing capability gaps receive adequate training and hardware support.

Policy Implementation Matrix

Method Category	**Best Applications**	**Data Requirements**	**State Capacity Readiness**
Basic Metrics (PFP/ CYI)	MSP formulation, quick yield estimates	Low (yield data only)	All states equipped
Advanced Econometrics (TFP/ SFA)	Long-term investment planning, scheme evaluation	High (input-output time series)	12 states currently capable
Spatial Methods (RS/GIS)	Drought monitoring, climate adaptation	Moderate (satellite+ ground data)	18 states with NRSC partnerships

A careful reading of the current evidence base implies that India, at this particular juncture, needs to think strategically about where and how each measurement approach is deployed. In broad terms, the very simplest indicators should continue to shoulder the load of day-to-day surveillance; the more data-intensive econometric models belong, quite naturally, in the realm of mid- and long-range policy design; and finally, spatially explicit, satellite-supported metrics are best reserved for climate-resilience planning, drought alerts, and allied early-warning tasks. Indeed, the field's emerging best practice already weaves these strands together: Total Factor Productivity supplies the macro-economic "big picture," Stochastic Frontier Analysis drills down into technical-efficiency gaps, and GIS layers pin-point where the problems (or successes) are unfolding. This tiered logic was piloted with some success in the recent PM-KISAN performance-assessment exercise (Ministry of Agriculture, 2023), which blended national-level TFP trends with district-scale SFA diagnostics, then overlaid both on satellite-derived vegetation maps to locate pockets of under-performance. Looking ahead, methodological innovation ought to prioritise the construction of interoperable, high-resolution databases, a single backbone, as it were, that can simultaneously feed all three analytical engines. Only through such integration will India move beyond fragmented, state-by-state snapshots toward a genuinely cohesive, evidence-driven productivity-measurement regime.

Conclusion

This systematic review of ten separate techniques for gauging agricultural productivity offers, on close inspection, several foundational insights into both the spatial and temporal dimensions of evaluating India's highly diverse agrarian mosaic. The analysis shows, almost unequivocally, that the sheer heterogeneity of

Indian agriculture spanning, on the one hand, the intensely fertile Indo-Gangetic plains and, on the other, the drought-susceptible Deccan plateau as well as the perennially humid coastal belts, requires, really, a pluralist measurement toolkit. Each methodological option carries its own, quite specific, geographical sensitivities; hence its practical utility fluctuates markedly across contrasting agro-ecological zones and farming systems.

One of the study's central findings is that the pronounced spatial variability of India's farm landscape routinely unsettles what might be called conventional measurement paradigms. The Partial Factor Productivity metric, for example, although perfectly serviceable for first-pass assessments in comparatively uniform settings such as Punjab's wheat belt, simply cannot capture the intricate interplay among terrain, soil chemistry, and micro-climate shaping yields in large stretches of peninsular India. Similarly, so-called "high-end" econometric tools, Stochastic Frontier Analysis is the textbook case, remain theoretically robust yet run into concrete hurdles once they confront India's sharply contrasting regions, from the stepped terraces of the Western Ghats all the way to the flood-washed flats of the Brahmaputra valley.

Geography, then, emerges as pivotal when judging how well (or poorly) a given measurement approach performs. Remote-sensing techniques illustrate the point particularly well: they tend to generate reliable estimates over the broad, mono-cropped fields that dominate north-west India but struggle, sometimes visibly, in the mixed-cropping mosaics typical of the Eastern Highlands. Such evidence underlines the imperative for regionally adapted protocols, ones that can accommodate local geomorphology and socio-ecological nuance.

The temporal dimension tells a similarly differentiated story. Climate-driven variability disrupts measurement consistency in markedly uneven ways: irrigated zones in the north-west, where yields stay relatively stable from year to year, lend themselves to lengthier trend studies, whereas the climate-sensitive, rain-fed belts of central India demand shorter, more adaptive assessment cycles. In effect, temporal and spatial considerations intersect, suggesting that any serious choice of a measurement framework has to weigh both the physical setting and the corresponding analytical time horizon.

Collectively, these observations point toward a simple yet far-reaching conclusion: the task of measuring agricultural productivity in India cannot be reduced to a single, universally "best" method. Rather, practitioners and policymakers alike must assemble a flexible, context-aware repertoire, selecting metrics that align simultaneously with the geography at hand and the temporal cadence most appropriate to that locale. Looking forward, the study emphasizes the need for measurement systems that better incorporate geographical parameters. Future frameworks should integrate topographical data, watershed characteristics, and microclimate patterns to develop more spatially sensitive productivity indicators. Such geographically-grounded approaches would better serve India's agricultural planning needs, from the village level to national policy formulation, while respecting the profound ecological diversity that defines the country's agrarian landscape. The transformation of India's agricultural measurement systems must therefore be rooted in geographical understanding, developing methodologies that are as diverse and adaptable as the landscapes they seek to measure. Only through such geographically-informed approaches can productivity assessments truly support sustainable agricultural transformation across India's varied agro-ecosystems.

References

1.Battese, G. E., & Coelli, T. J. (1995). A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data. *Empirical Economics, 20*(2), 325–332. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01205442

2.Birthal, P. S., Joshi, P. K., Roy, D., & Thorat, A. (2014). Sources of agricultural growth in India: Role of diversification towards high-value crops. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 69*(1), 1–17.

3.Chand, R., & Parappurathu, S. (2012). Temporal and spatial variations in agricultural growth and its determinants. *Economic and Political Weekly, 47*(26–27), 55–64.

4.Evenson, R. E., & Pray, C. E. (1991). *Research and productivity in Asian agriculture*. Cornell University Press.

5.Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (1996). *Agro-ecological zoning guidelines* (FAO Soils Bulletin No. 73). http://www.fao.org/3/w2962e/w2962e00.htm

6.Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR). (2018). *District-level agro-climatic zone reports*. https://www.icar.org.in

7.Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO). (2020). *Crop yield forecasting using remote sensing*. https://www.isro.gov.in

8.Kumar, K. S. K., & Parikh, J. (2001). Indian agriculture and climate sensitivity. *Global Environmental Change, 11*(2), 147–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780(00)00060-X

9.Kumar, P., & Mittal, S. (2006). Agricultural productivity trends in India: Role of technological and institutional factors. *Economic and Political Weekly, 41*(52), 5367–5375.

10.Lobell, D. B., Ortiz-Monasterio, J. I., & Asner, G. P. (2015). Satellite-based assessment of yield variation and its drivers in India. *Remote Sensing of Environment,161*,1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.02.008

11.Mendelsohn, R., Nordhaus, W. D., & Shaw, D. (1994). The impact of climate change on agriculture: A Ricardian analysis. *American Economic Review, 84*(4), 753–771.

12.National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). (2019). *Farmers' income and expenditure patterns in India*. https://www.nabard.org

13.Reserve Bank of India (RBI). (2021). *Report on trends in agricultural productivity in India*. https://www.rbi.org.in

14.Sharma, V., Singh, P., & Aggarwal, R. (2020). Efficiency of Indian agriculture: A state-level DEA approach. *Journal of Quantitative Economics, 18*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40953-019-00175-x

15. Singh, J., & Singh, R. (2017). *Farm business analysis: Concepts and practices* (3rd ed.). Kalyani Publishers.

****