EFFECT OF CROP DIVERSIFICATION ON INCOME AND EXPENDITURE-ACOMPARATIVESTUDYINAGENCYANDNON-AGENCYAREASINCOASTALANDHRAPRADESH

K.Manikanta[1]Pro
f.SurePullaRao[2]

[1]ResearchScholar,
[2]Professor & Head of the Department, Department of Economics, College of Arts & Commerce, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract

Agriculture remains a vital sector for India, supporting nearly 45% of the workforce and contributing 18% to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2024 (Government of India, 2024). However, the sector is riddled with challenges such as diminishing landholdings, fluctuating crop yields, market instability, and climate-induced uncertainties. In this context, crop diversification has gained attention as a transformative strategy to enhance agricultural productivity, stabilize incomes, and promote sustainability. This approach is seen as a pathway to optimize land use, enhance farmers' resilience to risks, and align agricultural practices with market demand. By enabling small and marginal farmers to shift from traditional subsistence farming to high-value crops, crop diversification can serve as a catalyst for rural economic growth and food security. This paper focuses on examining the relationship between crop diversification and its influence on the income and expenditure of small farmers. The analysis delves into both Agencyand non-Agencyareas, consideringthe distinct socio-economic and agro-climatic conditions of these regions. The study not onlyidentifies the financial outcomes of diversification but also sheds light on its role in enhancing economic resilience and fostering sustainable agricultural practices.

Keywords: GrossDomesticProduct,Cropdiversification,Cropyields,landholdings, Agro-climatic conditions

---

1. Introduction

Crop diversification, the practice of growing a variety of crops instead of relying on a single crop, has emerged as a critical strategy to enhance agricultural sustainability, increase income, and reduce risks for farmers. This approach plays a significant role in improving the livelihood of small farmers by providing them with multiplesourcesof revenue,mitigatingtheimpactsofmarketfluctuationsandclimate

risks, and ensuring better utilization of available resources. In this context, understanding the impact of crop diversification on the income and expenditure of small farmers becomes crucial, particularly in regions like Coastal Andhra Pradesh, where agriculture forms the backbone of the rural economy. Coastal Andhra Pradesh, with its diverse agro-climatic zones, presents a valuable case study for understanding the impacts of crop diversification. The region is divided into agency areas (tribal-dominated, forested, and less accessible regions) and non-agency areas (plains with irrigation facilities), each with unique agricultural practices, socio-economic dynamics, and infrastructure availability. The varying levels of access to irrigation, markets, and technology create a distinct environment for assessing how crop diversification affects income generation, expenditure patterns, and overall rural development. Studies suggest that diversification in these regions can lead toenhanced farmer resilience and contribute to improved socio-economic outcomes, particularly when aligned with government policies and interventions aimed at promoting sustainable agricultural practices (Chowdary et al., 2022).

The present paper focuses on examining the relationship between crop diversification and its influence on the income and expenditure of small farmers. The analysis delves into both Agency and non-Agency areas, considering the distinct socio-economic and agro-climatic conditions of these regions. The study not only identifies the financial outcomes of diversification but also sheds light on its role in enhancing economic resilience and fostering sustainable agricultural practices. To achievethis,tworegressionmodelswereemployedtoquantitativelyassess theimpact of crop diversification. The first model explores the relationship between crop diversification and farmers' income, identifying key determinants and their significance in shaping income patterns. The second model examines the effects of crop diversification on household expenditure, particularly focusing on how changes inincomeduetodiversificationtranslateinto expenditureon essentialitemslikefood, education, and health. Through these models, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of the dual dimensions of income and expenditure, highlighting the economic significance of adopting diversified cropping systems. By comparing the outcomes for Agency and non-Agency areas, this chapter also provides critical insights into the regional disparities and policy implications for promoting crop diversification as a strategy for improving the livelihoods of small farmers.

This paper aims to conduct a comparative analysis between Agency and non-Agency areas to understand how the factors influencing income and expenditure patterns differ in these regions. While both areas benefit from cropdiversification, the socio-economic and infrastructural differences between Agency and non-Agencyareas lead to different outcomes in terms of income stability, expenditure management, and overall economic resilience. In Agency areas, factors such as land tenure, market access, and resource constraints may limit the ability of farmers tofully capitalize on the potential benefits of diversification. Conversely, farmers innon-Agency areas may face different challenges, such as labor shortages, land fragmentation, and market dependency, which can influence the extent to which diversification contributes to their economic well-being. The chapter also seeks to identify the key determinants that influence crop diversification decisions in both areas, such as socio-economic factors, availability of resources, and access to markets and technology. By doing so, the chapter aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of crop diversification in shaping the income and expenditure patterns of small farmers, thereby offering valuable insights for policymakers and development practitioners who are working to promote sustainable agricultural practices in Coastal Andhra Pradesh. Ultimately, this analysis will contribute to the development of targeted strategies that can enhance the income- generating capacity and economic security of smallholder farmers, particularly in the context of climate change and evolving market dynamics.

ObjectivesoftheStudy

1. To examine the effect and interrelationship between crop diversification andthe income of small farmers.
2. To examine the effect and interrelationship between crop diversification andexpenditure of small farmers.
3. Tosuggestpolicymeasurestopromotecropdiversificationforimproving farmers' income.

ResearchMethodology

The research methodology is designed to provide a systematic, objective, and comprehensive analysis of crop diversification and its impact on the income and expenditure of small farmers in Coastal Andhra Pradesh. A multi-stage random sampling technique is used to select studyareas and participants, ensuring the process isbothrepresentativeandstatisticallyvalid.Themethodologyisstructuredasin

step I, selection of state is Andhra Pradesh, Costal Andhra in particular stands out for its high agricultural productivity, cultivating a wide range of crops. Step II selectionof district, in Andhra Pradesh consisting of 26 Districts among these two districtshave been chosen in the Costal Andhra. These districts are Alluri Sitha Rama Raju districts in agency area, and East Godavari districts in non-agency area. In step III selection of mandals, in agency area out of 22 mandals in Alluri Sitha Rama Raju districts two mandals have been chosen which are Chintapalli mandal and Koyyuru mandal. In non-agency area two mandals have been chosen in East Godavari districts out of 64 mandals in the districts Kovvuru and Chagallu mandals have been chosen. Step IV selection of villages, for each selected mandal, specific villages are chosen based on the presence of smallholder farmers and the variety of crops cultivated. A stratifiedrandom samplingtechnique ensures the representation ofboth high andlow-diversity crop areas.

SourcesofData

The data for this studyis obtained from both primaryand secondarysources to ensure comprehensive and reliable results.

Secondary Data:

Secondary data complements the primary data and is sourced from various government records and reports, including publications from Agricultural Development Agencies and reports from other relevant government departments. Additional secondarydata is gathered from agricultural journals, research papers, and books on topics such as crop diversification, agricultural economics, and rural development.

PrimaryData:

Primary data has been collected through a farm-level survey conducted amongfarmers in the selected villages of the study area. In the agency area of Alluri Sitharama Raju district, due to challenges in gathering data from a sufficient number of farmers in each village, 8 villages from each mandal are selected, with 10 farmers chosen from each village. This ensures a total of 80 farmers per mandal are surveyed, representing the tribal areas adequately despite logistical difficulties. In the non- agency area of East Godavari district, 20 farmers are selected from each of the four villages in each mandal, leading to a total of 80 farmers per mandal. This ensures a diverse and representative sample of the farming community in non-agency areas.The sample size is 320 house holds in both agency and non-agency areas.

ToolsofAnalysis

Toanalyzethecollected data,thefollowingtools was employed:

Linear Regression Model: This model analyzes the relationship between crop diversification and household food securityand income levels. It helps understand how changes in crop diversification practices affect the economic status offarming households.

2. **CropDiversification**

Crop diversification plays a crucial role in enhancing the resilience of farming systems, particularly in regions where agricultural practices are highly dependent on a limited set of crops. This variable refers to the practice of growing a range of crops rather than focusing on a single crop, which is a common practice in traditional farming systems. Diversification can be achieved through the inclusion of various food crops, commercial crops, and horticulture within the same agricultural system. The importance of crop diversification lies in its ability to spread risks across multiple crops, reducing the vulnerability of farmers to potential losses from pests, diseases, weather extremes, or market price fluctuations. In regions that rely heavily on monoculture (growing a single crop), the risk is concentrated, and crop failure or price drops can have devastating impacts on household income. On the other hand, diversified farming systems allow for multiple income streams, which help households adapt to shocks and maintainstableincomelevels overtime.Cropdiversificationis expectedtohavea positive impact on income in rural areas, especially in non-Agency areas. Non-Agency farmers often have better access to markets, technology, and agricultural inputs (such as seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides) that support diversified farming. Additionally, non-Agency farmers are more likely to benefit from extension services and market information, allowing them to optimize the production and sale of a variety of crops, which ultimately enhances household income.

However, in Agency areas, crop diversification may have a relatively weaker impact on income. Agency communities face several challenges, such as limited access to technology, low literacy levels, and remoteness from markets, all of which reduce the incentives and ability for farmers to diversify. As a result, Agency farmers may remain reliant on traditional cropping patterns that are less diverse and often less economically productive. Despite these challenges, crop diversificationinAgencyareascanstillplayacriticalroleinenhancingfood

security and reducing economic vulnerability by spreading risk across different crops. However, the magnitude of its income-enhancing effect may be smallerthan in non-Agency areas due to limited market access and low levels of agricultural development.

Table1:CropDiversificationinAgencyandNon-agencyareas

Crop Diversification Category	Agency (Frequency&Percentage)	Non-Agency (Frequency & Percentage)	Overall (Frequency&Percentage)
Low	81 (50.6%)	1 (0.6%)	82 (25.6%)
FairlyLow	19 (11.9%)	3 (1.9%)	22 (6.9%)
Medium	31 (19.4%)	61 (38.1%)	92 (28.8%)
FairlyHigh	21 (13.1%)	47 (29.4%)	68 (21.3%)
High	8 (5%)	48 (30%)	56 (17.5%)

The crop diversification patterns across Agency, non-Agency, and overall populations reveal notable differences, with Agency farmers predominantly exhibiting lower levels of crop diversification compared to their non-Agency counterparts. In the Agency areas, 50.6% of farmers have low diversification, growing only a few staple crops with limited variety. This is likely due to several challenges faced by Agency farmers, including access to resources like credit, irrigation, and advanced agricultural technologies. As a result, they are more vulnerable to risks such as crop failure and market price fluctuations. In contrast, non-Agency farmers exhibit a much higher rate of diversification, with only 0.6% of non-Agency farmers in the low diversification category. Non-Agency regions tend to have better infrastructure, more access to modern farming practices, and stronger market linkages, which enable farmers to diversify their cropping systems,mitigatingtherisksassociatedwithmonoculturefarming.Overall,25.6%

ofthesampleis categorizedunderlow crop diversification, reflecting asignificant gap between the two regions. In the medium diversification category, Agency farmers make up 19.4%, while non-Agency farmers show a much larger proportion of 38.1%. Medium diversification indicates that farmers are cultivating a range of crops but are still not fully maximizing their crop diversity. This levelof diversification is beneficial as it helps reduce risk by spreading potential losses across various crops, which is especially important in an era of unpredictable weather patterns and fluctuating market conditions. While Agency farmers are beginning to diversify their crops, they are still somewhat restricted by various barriers, such as financial constraints and limited access to agricultural knowledge and infrastructure. On the other hand, the higher percentage of non-Agency farmers in the medium diversification category reflects a more proactive approach to diversification, likely facilitated by better access to resources and services. Overall, 28.8% of the sample shows medium crop diversification, with a larger share of non-Agency farmers compared to Agency ones. This category marks a significant middle ground in terms of crop diversification, but it is clear that more can be done to encourage further diversification in both areas.

In terms of higher levels of diversification, both Agency and non-Agency areas show disparities. Only 5% of Agency farmers achieve high crop diversification, compared to 30% of non-Agency farmers. This is the most diversified category, where farmers grow a wide variety of crops, reducing their dependency on asingle crop and enhancing income stability and resilience to market or environmental shocks. The limited number of highly diversified farmers in the Agency area could be due to factors such as limited market access, low levels of education and agricultural training, and traditional farming practices. In non- Agency areas, however, the higher percentage of farmers in the high diversification category demonstrates the benefits of improved infrastructure and agricultural support systems. Overall, the percentage of farmers achieving high crop diversification is 17.5%, with a clear skew towards non-Agency regions. These findings suggest that encouraging more farmers, especially in Agencyareas, to diversify their crops could enhance their economic resilience, contribute to more sustainable farming systems, and improve overall food security. Promoting greater diversification through targeted policies, including access to betterirrigation,financialservices,andagriculturalextensionprograms,could

help bridge the gap between Agency and non-Agency areas, creating more equitable and sustainable agricultural practices across regions.

3. EffectofCropdiversificationonIncomeandExpenditureofthesmall Farmers

The primary objective of this paper is to analyze the impact of crop diversification on income and expenditure for small farmers in Agency and non-Agency areas of Coastal Andhra Pradesh. The chapter seeks to explore how crop diversification influences the economic outcomes of farmers, specifically focusing on its effect on income generation and expenditure patterns. By examining these variables, the chapter will provide insights into the economic benefits of diversification and how it can contribute to improved financial resilience for small farmers.

Incomeof households

The income of households is a key indicator of economic well-being, and in the context of rural and agricultural economies, it is a crucial measure of the success or vulnerability of a household. In this regression model, income serves as the dependent variable, representing the annual earnings or financial resources availableto a household. The goal of the model is to explore how various independent (predictor) variables influence the income levels of households, particularly inAgency and non-Agency areas. Understanding these relationships can offer insights into which factors most significantly affect income disparities between these areas, as well as guide policy recommendations for improving household income and overall welfare.

Income is a pivotal indicator of economic well-being, particularly in rural and agricultural economies. It encapsulates the financial resources available to a household, derived from various income-generating activities. In the context of rural areas, particularly in developing countries, income is often multifaceted and includes agricultural income, off-farm income, and transfer income. Each of these components contributes to a household's overall economic stability and resilience in the face of external shocks, such as crop failure, price fluctuations, or changes in market conditions. Understanding the role of income and its relation to various socio-economic factors is essential for policymakers and researchers aiming to improve household livelihoods and reduce poverty.

AgriculturalIncome:

For rural households, agricultural income remains the dominant source of livelihood. It includes earnings derived from farming, whether through crop production, livestock farming, or fisheries. Agricultural activities are highly sensitive to a range of environmental factors, including rainfall patterns, access to irrigation, land quality, and the availability of inputs like seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides. Inrural economies, particularly in Agency areas, agricultural income can be highly volatile and dependent on the seasonality of crops and the risks associated withnatural disasters such as droughts or floods. Despite its volatility, agriculture often represents the backbone ofrural economies,providing food,employment, andincome for the majority of the population.

In the context of Agency areas, the agricultural income may be more prone to fluctuations due to the reliance on traditional farming practices, lack of access to modernagriculturaltechnologies,andlimitedinfrastructureforirrigation.Conversely, non-Agency areas, where more modern agricultural practices are common, may exhibit more stable and diversified agricultural income streams, contributing tooverall higher household income.

Table-2:DetailsofIncomeoftheHouseholdPerAnnum

Sl.No	Incomeofthe Household per Annum	AgencyArea (Frequency)	AgencyArea (Percent%)	Non-agency Area (Frequency)	Non-agency Area (Percent%)
1	LessthanRs. 50,000	28	17.50	18	11.25
2	Rs51,000– Rs 1,00,000	61	38.13	75	46.88
3	Rs1,00,001– Rs 2,00,000	49	30.63	43	26.88
4	Rs2,00,001– Rs 5,00,000	17	10.63	17	10.63
5	Morethan Rs. 5,00,000	5	3.13	7	4.38

(source:Primarydata)

Table-2 presents an analysis of the income distribution across two regions, Agency Area and Non-agency Area, with data classified into five income categories. This table provides valuable insights into the economic status of households in both areas, highlighting differences in income levels and offering a basis for understanding thedisparitiesbetweenthetworegions. InthelessthanRs.50,000categories,17.50% ofhouseholdsintheAgencyAreafallunderthisincomebracket,while11.25%of

households in the Non-agency Area report similar income levels. This shows that a higher proportion of households in the Agency Area earn very low incomes,indicating possible challenges such as limited access to markets, infrastructure, and financial services. In comparison, the Non-agency Area has a smaller percentage in this category, which could reflect better economic conditions and opportunities for households to earn higher incomes.

The Rs. 51,000 – Rs. 1,00,000 category represents the largest portion of households in both regions. In the Agency Area, 38.13% of households earn within this range, whereas the Non-agency Area has a slightly higher percentage at 46.88%. This suggests that the Non-agency Area has a larger proportion of households with moderate income levels, possibly due to greater access to resources, employment opportunities, andmarket infrastructure. This pattern indicates that while both regions face challenges, the Non-agency Area may have more diverse sources of income or better economic opportunities. For the Rs. 1,00,001 – Rs. 2,00,000 category, 30.63% of households in the Agency Area fall within this income range, compared to 26.88% in the Non-agency Area. This reflects that the Agency Area has a relatively higher proportion of households in the upper-middle-income category, possibly due to agricultural activities or off-farm employment. The Non-agency Area, althoughhaving fewer households in this bracket, may offer more diversified income sources. In the Rs. 2,00,001 – Rs. 5,00,000 category, the percentages are identical in both regions at 10.63%, showing that a small portion of households in both areas achieve relatively high income levels. This may be attributed to successful small businesses, larger-scale farming, or remittances. Lastly, the more than Rs. 5,00,000 category has 3.13% of households in the Agency Area and 4.38% in the Non-agency Area. This difference, though marginal, suggests that the Non-agency Area has a slightly higher proportion of high-income households, possibly due to better access to markets and external resources.

The average income in the Agency Area is significantly lower than in theNon-agency Area, with the former showing a greater concentration of low-income households. The data reflect that households in the Agency Area are more likely to earn less, while those in the Non-agency Area have a more even income distribution and tend to earn slightly higher incomes. This disparity highlights the importance of infrastructure, market access, and financial services in improving household income, especiallyintheAgencyArea.Targetedinterventionssuchasimprovingmarket

access, credit availability, and agricultural productivity can help bridge this income gap and promote economic development in the Agency Area.

4. SourcesofFinanceforCultivation

Sources of finance for cultivation is most crucial factors for improving the economic stability and growth of rural households, particularly those engaged in small-scale agriculture. In many rural areas, especially in low-income countries, access to credit can significantly enhance a household's capacity to invest in agricultural inputs, technology, and infrastructure. These Credit facilities provide the necessary financial resources to purchase seeds, fertilizers, equipment, and hire labor, thereby improving productivity and income. For smallholder farmers, access to credit is vital for overcoming seasonal cash flow shortages, allowing them to makenecessary investments at critical points in the farming cycle, such as during plantingor harvesting seasons.

Table provides an overview of the various sources of finance for cultivation in agency and non-agency areas. It highlights a significant difference in how farmers in these two areas access financial resources. Personal savings are the primary source of finance for cultivation, with 48.75% of non-agency area farmers relying on their savings, compared to 30.63% of those in the agency area. This indicates a stronger dependence on personal funds in non-agency areas, possibly due to limited access to formal financial institutions. Bank loans are more common in the agency area (20%) compared to the non-agency area (7.5%), suggesting that farmers in the agency area are better integrated into formal banking systems. Government subsidies are more accessible in the agency area (14.38%) than in the non-agency area (5%), further emphasizing the institutional support available in agency areas. Additionally, microfinance institutions are more utilized in the agency area (10.63%) compared to the non-agencyarea (1.88%). Credit from family and friends is a significant source of finance in both areas, with 50.63% of farmers in the agency area and 43.75% in the non-agency area relying on informal networks. This reflects the crucial role of social capital in agricultural financing in both regions.

Table3:SourcesofFinanceforCultivation

Sourceof Finance	Agency (Frequency &Percentage)	Non-Agency (Frequency &Percentage)	Overall (Frequency &Percentage)	Chi-square Statistic	p-value
Personal	49 (30.63%)	78 (48.75%)	127 (39.69%)	6.62	0.0101

Savings					
BankLoans	32 (20%)	12 (7.5%)	44 (13.75%)	9.09	0.0026
Government Subsidies	23 (14.38%)	8 (5%)	31 (9.69%)	7.26	0.0071
Microfinance Institutions	17 (10.63%)	3 (1.88%)	20 (6.25%)	9.80	0.0017
Cooperative Societies	9 (5.63%)	5 (3.13%)	14 (4.38%)	1.14	0.2850
Creditfrom Familyand Friends	25 (15.63%)	70 (43.75%)	95 (29.69%)	21.32	3.90e-06
Others	81 (50.63%)	6 (3.75%)	87 (27.19%)	64.66	8.92e-16

The comparison of the sources of finance between Agency and non-Agency households reveals significant disparities in financial behavior and access toresources, as shown by the chi-square statistics. Among the sources, personal savings standoutasacrucial financialresource,especiallyfornon-Agencyhouseholds,which rely on it more heavily (48.75%) than their Agency counterparts (30.63%). This difference is statistically significant, with a chi-square value of 6.62 and a p-value of 0.0101, suggesting that non-Agency households have better access to or greater capacity for savings. This may be due to more stable income sources, access to banking services, and a higher level of financial literacy. In contrast, Agency households might face challenges in accumulating savings, likelydue to their reliance on subsistence farming and limited access to formal financial services. Similarly,bank loans are more accessible to Agency households (20%) than non-Agency households (7.5%), a significant difference indicated by a chi-square statistic of 9.09 and a p-value of 0.0026. This could reflect targeted government initiatives or local development programs designed to increase access to credit in Agency areas, or itmay suggest that Agency communities are more reliant on loans for economic survival.

Further examination of financial sources reveals that government subsidies play a more prominent role in Agency areas, where 14.38% of households depend on them, comparedto just 5%in non-Agencyareas, with asignificant chi-square statistic of 7.26 (p-value 0.0071). This disparitycan be attributed to regional policies aimed at improving the economic conditions of Agency communities, where government subsidies are a vital source of financial support. Microfinance institutions are another importantfinancialsourceforAgencyhouseholds,with10.63%ofthemrelyingon

microfinance, significantly more than non-Agency households (1.88%). This trend, with a chi-square statistic of 9.80 and a p-value of 0.0017, points to the critical role of microfinance in providing financial support to marginalized communities that might otherwise lack access to formal credit. These institutions often serve as a lifeline for Agency households, which may have limited access to banks. Cooperative societies, on the other hand, show no significant difference between the two groups (p-value 0.2850), suggesting that while cooperative societies may offer financial benefits, they are not as widely used or effective as other sources in both Agency and non-Agency areas.

The most striking difference is seen in credit from family and friends, with non-Agency households relying on this source far more (43.75%) than Agency households (15.63%), supported by a highly significant chi-square statistic of 21.32 and a p-value of 3.90e-06. This might reflect stronger social networks and a more robust informal economy in non-Agency areas, where family and friends play a significant role in providing financial assistance. Lastly, the "Others" category, representing informal or alternative sources of finance, shows an overwhelmingly higher reliance in Agency areas (50.63%) compared to non-Agency areas (3.75%), a difference confirmed bya chi-square statistic of 64.66 and a p-value of 8.92e-16. This suggests that Agency households often turn to informal sources, such as community lending or barter systems, due to a lack of access to formal financial services. These significant differences across various sources of finance highlight the economic divides between Agency and non-Agency communities, where access to formal financial systems and government support plays a crucial role in shaping financial behaviors.

5. ImpactofCropDiversificationonIncomeand Expenditure

To investigate the relationship between income, expenditure, and various independent variables such as crop diversification, access to credit, education level, marketaccess,irrigationfacilities,andsocialsupport,amultipleregression analysisis employed. This statistical technique is particularly suitable for this study, as it allows for the simultaneous examination of multiple predictors on the dependent variables, whichin this case are incomeandexpenditure. Themultiple regression model enables the analysis of the combined effect of these independent variables while controlling forpotentialconfoundingfactorsthatmayinfluencebothincomeandexpenditure

levels. This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of how these factors contribute to the financial well-being of small farmers.

MultipleRegression

Multiple regression is an extension of simple linear regression, where multiple predictors (independent variables) are used to explain variations in the dependent variable (income). By incorporating several independent variables, this method provides a more nuanced understanding of how each factor influences income while accounting for the potential interrelationships between these predictors. For instance, factors like education and market access may interact in complex ways, and multiple regression allows for these interactions to be considered simultaneously.

ModelSpecificationforImpactofCropDiversificationon Income

The general form of the **multiple regression model** used in this analysis is as follows:

$$Y = Q0 + Q1x1 + Q2x2 + Q3x3 + Q4x4 + Q5x5 + Q6x6 + Q7x7 + Q8x8 + Q9x9 + Q10x10 + Q11x11 + c$$

Where:

Y→Income: Represents thetotalhouseholdincome.

β_0→Intercept (constant term) that represents the expected income when all predictors are zero.

$\beta_1, \beta_2, ..., \beta_6$→The coefficients representing the effect of each independent variableon income.

ε →Represents the error term or residuals, accounting for unexplained variations in income.

X_1→ **Access to Credit**: Quantitativevariableindicating the extent ofcredit accessfor small farmers, measured by the total amount of credit or frequency of access. It playsa crucial role in determining farmers' ability to diversify crops.

X_2→ **Education Level**: Quantitative variable representing the education level of the household head or members, typically measured in years of schooling. Higher education levels often correlate with better decision-making and adoption of crop diversification practices.

X_3→**Access to Irrigation**: Quantitative variable measuring the extent or availability of irrigation facilities. Better access to irrigation reduces dependency on rainfall, enabling a broader choice of crops.

X_4→Market Access: Quantitative variable indicating the ease of access to marketsfor selling crops, measured in terms of distance to the nearest market or market frequency. Improved market access incentivizes diversification.

X_5→Household Size: Quantitative variable measured by the total number of family members in the household. Larger households may have more labor available, potentially supporting diversification.

X_6→Landholding Size: Quantitative variable denoting the size of landholdings, measured in hectares or acres. Larger landholdings typically allow for more diversification.

X_7→Distance to Nearest Town: Quantitative variable measured in kilometers, representing the distance from the farmer's residence to the nearest town. Longer distances might hinder market access and crop diversification.

X_8→Social Support: Quantitative variable reflecting the level of community or governmental support available to farmers, such as subsidies or training programs. Greater support fosters diversification.

X_9→Age of Household Head: Quantitative variable measured in years. Younger household heads may be more willing to experiment with diverse crops, while older ones might prefer traditional farming.

X_{10}→Agricultural Training: Dummy variable (1 = Received training, 0 = No training) indicating whether the farmer has received any agricultural training.Training improves knowledge and skills, facilitating diversification.

X_{11}→ Crop Diversification: Quantitative variable indicating the degree of diversity in crop production. It is often measured using indices like the Simpson Index or other metrics.

Table-4:RegressionSummaryforIncome

RegressionSummaryforDependentVariable:IncomeoftheRespondent R = 0.9924R-squared = 0.9884 Adjusted R^2= 0.9837 n= 320 F(14, 305)= 868.64 p<0.0000 StdRoot MSE= 0.546				
Variable	**Estimate**	**Std.Error**	**t value**	p-value
Intercept	0.003	0.14	2.01	0.09
Accessto Credit	0.17	0.76	2.04	0.04*
EducationLevel	0.04	0.30	2.14	0.04*
AccesstoIrrigation	0.09	0.04	2.29	0.02
MarketAccess	0.22	0.24	-0.82	0.41
Household Size	0.17	0.14	1.41	0.16
LandholdingSize	0.18	0.27	3.02	0.005**

Distanceto Nearest Town	-0.02	0.01	-0.83	0.4
Social Support	0.77	0.33	0.64	0.525
AgeofHousehold Head	0.09	0.02	0.10	0.91
Agricultural Training	1.41	0.53	0.54	0.58
ACrop Diversification	0.72	0.52	3.12	0.002**

*significant@1%level,

**significant@5%level

The regression analysis for the Income of the Respondent identified several statistically significant variables and some that were not significant. The significant variables include Access to Credit, Education Level, Access to Irrigation,Landholding Size, and Crop Diversification. These variables had p-values less than 0.05, indicating that they have a reliable influence on household income. On the other hand, the variables Market Access, Household Size, Distance to Nearest Town, Social Support, Age of Household Head, and Agricultural Training were not statistically significant, with p-values greater than 0.05, meaning that these factors do not have a reliable effect on household income in this context.

The significant variables provide important insights into what influences income levels in the study area. Access to Credit has a positive coefficient of 0.17, suggesting that households with access to credit tend to have higher income. This could be because access to credit allows families to invest in income-generating activities such as expanding their business or improving agricultural practices. Similarly, Education Level, with a coefficient of 0.04, is positively correlated with income,whichis expectedashighereducationlevels oftentranslateinto better-paying job opportunities. Access to Irrigation (coefficient of 0.09) plays an important role in boosting income, as irrigation enables farmers to grow crops throughout the year, leading to increased agricultural productivity and, consequently, higher income. Landholding Size (coefficient of 0.18) is also a significant factor, as larger landholdings enable households to produce more crops, which directly contributes to greater income. Additionally, Crop Diversification (coefficient of 0.72) shows a significant positive relationship with income, indicating that households with diversified crop production tend to have higher income due to reduced risk and more stable revenue sources.

On the other hand, the variables that were not statistically significant in the model include Market Access, Household Size, Distance to Nearest Town, Social Support,AgeofHouseholdHead,andAgriculturalTraining.MarketAccess

(coefficient of 0.22) did not show a significant impact on income despite its positive relationship, suggesting that being closer to markets does not have a substantial effect on household income. Household Size (coefficient of 0.17) also did not emerge as a statisticallysignificant factor, meaning that larger households did not necessarily earn more income. This could be due to the fact that household size might be associated with greater expenses rather than income. Distance to Nearest Town (coefficient of -0.02)also did notsignificantlyaffectincome,indicatingthat livingfartherfrom towns does not directly influence income in this model. Social Support (coefficient of 0.77) was not significanteither, suggestingthat receiving governmentaidor assistancedoes nothaveareliableeffect onhouseholdincome.Similarly,theAgeofHouseholdHead (coefficient of 0.09) and Agricultural Training (coefficient of 1.41) were found to be statistically insignificant, meaning that factors such as the age of the household head and agricultural training did not have a strong influence on income levels in thisstudy. Overall, the analysis shows that factors directly related to agricultural productivity, such as landholding size, irrigation access, and crop diversification, play a more significant role in shaping household income than other socio-economicfactors

6. ImpactofCropDiversificationonExpenditure

Crop diversification, the practice of cultivating a variety of crops rather than relyingon asinglecrop, hasaprofound impacton theexpenditurepatterns offarming households. One of the key ways crop diversification influences expenditures is by altering input costs. Diversified cropping systems often require a broader range of inputs, including seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and labor tailored to the needs of multiple crops. While this can increase the initial expenditure on farming, it also reduces the risks associated with crop failures, pests, or market price fluctuations. For instance, if a farmer grows both food crops and high-value commercial crops, the financial losses from a poor market price for one crop can be offset by gains from another, stabilizing overall household expenses. This strategic approach to farming reduces the likelihood of debt cycles, particularly for small and marginal farmers. Moreover, crop diversification impacts post-harvest expenditure, particularly in storage, transportation, and marketing. Diversified cropping often requiresinvestments in suitable storage facilities to prevent spoilage, especially for perishable cropslikefruitsandvegetables.Transportationcostsmayalsoincreaseasfarmers

need to reach different market destinations to sell their diverse produce. However, these additional expenditures are frequently offset by higher returns from high-value crops, enabling farmers to improve their financial stability. Additionally, growing multiple crops may encourage farmers to participate in cooperatives or self-help groups to optimize marketing efforts, leading to shared costs and better pricing in the long run. Therefore, while diversification may demand higher spending initially, it lays the groundwork for improved financial resilience.

Multipleregressionmodel

$$Y = Q0 + Q1x1 + Q2x2 + Q3x3 + Q4x4 + Q5x5 + Q6x6 + Q7x7 + Q8x8 + Q9x9 + Q10x10 + Q11x11 + c$$

Where:

Y→Expenditure: RepresentsthetotalExpenditureofthehousehold.

β_0→ Intercept (constant term) that represents the expected income when all predictors are zero.

β_1, β_2, ..., β_6→ The coefficients representing the effect of each independent variable on income.

ε → Represents the error term or residuals, accounting for unexplained variations in income.

X_1→ Access to Credit: Quantitative variable indicating the extent of credit access for small farmers, measured by the total amount of credit or frequency of access. It plays a crucial role in determining farmers' ability to diversify crops.

X_2→Education Level:Quantitative variable representingthe education level of the household head or members, typically measured in years of schooling. Higher education levels often correlate with better decision-making and adoption of crop diversification practices.

X_3→Access to Irrigation: Quantitative variable measuring the extent or availability of irrigation facilities. Better access to irrigation reduces dependency on rainfall, enabling a broader choice of crops.

X_4→Market Access: Quantitative variable indicating the ease of access to markets for selling crops, measured in terms of distance to the nearest market or market frequency. Improved market access incentivizes diversification.

X_5→Household Size: Quantitative variable measured by the total number of family members in the household. Larger households may have more labor available, potentially supporting diversification.

X_6→Landholding Size: Quantitative variable denoting the size of landholdings, measured in hectares or acres. Larger landholdings typically allow for more diversification.

X_7→Distance to Nearest Town: Quantitative variable measured in kilometers, representing the distance from the farmer's residence to the nearest town. Longer distances might hinder market access and crop diversification.

X_8→Social Support: Quantitative variable reflecting the level of community or governmental support available to farmers, such as subsidies or training programs. Greater support fosters diversification.

X_9→Age of Household Head: Quantitative variable measured in years. Younger household heads may be more willing to experiment with diverse crops, while older ones might prefer traditional farming.

X_{10}→Agricultural Training: Dummy variable (1 = Received training, 0 = No training) indicating whether the farmer has received any agricultural training. Training improves knowledge and skills, facilitating diversification.

X_{11}→ Crop Diversification: Quantitative variable indicating the degree of diversityin crop production. ItisoftenmeasuredusingindiceslikeTheSimpson Index or other metrics.

Table-5:RegressionSummaryfor Expenditure

RegressionSummaryforDependentVariable:Expenditureofhousehold R= 0.9924R-squared = 0.9849Adjusted R^2= 0.9843 n= 320 F(14, 305)= 868.64 p<0.0000 StdRoot MSE= 0.466				
Variable	Coefficient	StandardError	t-Statistic	p-value
Intercept	-0.005	0.43	-0.93	0.35
Accessto Credit	0.19	0.23	0.58	0.55
AccesstoIrrigation	-0.15	0.15	-0.88	0.37
EducationLevel	0.01	0.15	2.44	0.04*
Market Access	0.019	0.09	0.45	0.65
Household Size	0.019	0.61	3.42	0.004**
LandholdingSize	-0.107	0.22	3.68	0.002**
Distanceto Nearest Town	-0.16	0.45	-1.46	0.14

Social Support	-0.19	0.091	1.56	0.63
AgeofHousehold Head	0.15	0.23	2.31	0.021 *
Crop Diversification	0.02	0.93	2.11	0.03 *

*significant@1%level,

**significant@5%level

In the regression analysis for Expenditure of the Respondent, several variables were found to be statistically significant, while others were not. The significant variables are Education Level, Household Size, Landholding Size, Age of Household Head, and Crop Diversification, with p-values less than 0.05. These factors are considered to have a reliable impact on household expenditure. The non-significant variables include Intercept, Access to Credit, Access to Irrigation, Market Access, Social Support, and Distance to Nearest Town, with p-values greater than 0.05, indicating that these factors do not have a consistent or strong effect on household spending.

The significant variables reveal important insights about household expenditure. Education Level (coefficient of 0.01) shows a positive relationship with expenditure, suggesting that as the education level of household members increases, households tend to spend slightly more. This may be because more educated individuals may prioritize spending on goods and services that improve their qualityof life, such as healthcare or education for children. Household Size (coefficient of 0.019) is also significant, with larger households typically spending more. Larger families generally require more food, clothing, and other necessities, which leads to higher spending. Similarly, Landholding Size (coefficient of -0.107) negativelyaffects expenditure, indicating that households with larger landholdings tend to spend less. This could be because they produce more food themselves, reducing the need to purchase from markets. Age of Household Head (coefficient of 0.15) also positively influences expenditure, suggesting that older household heads, possibly due to more stable financial situations or accumulated wealth, tend to spend more. Finally, Crop Diversification (coefficient of 0.02) has a positive but small effect on expenditure, indicating that households with a greater variety of crops may have more disposable income, leading to increased spending.

On the other hand, the non-significant variables include Intercept, Access to Credit,AccesstoIrrigation,MarketAccess,SocialSupport,andDistancetoNearest

Town. The Intercept is close to zero (-0.005), suggesting that, in the absence of other factors, household expenditure would not change significantly. Access to Credit (coefficient of 0.19) and Access to Irrigation (coefficient of -0.15) both show weak relationships with expenditure, but their p-values of 0.55 and 0.37, respectively, indicate that these factors do not significantly affect spending. Similarly, Market Access (coefficient of 0.019) and Social Support (coefficient of -0.19) did not show a significant impact on expenditure, with p-values of 0.65 and 0.63. Lastly, Distance to Nearest Town (coefficient of -0.16) also does not significantly affect expenditure, as its p-value of 0.14 suggests that distance from town is not a reliable factor influencing household spending. Overall, this regression analysis suggests that household size, landholding size, and other demographic factors like education and age have a stronger influence on expenditure than factors like credit access, irrigation, and proximity to markets.

7. ResearchFindings

Multipleregressionanalysisonincomeofthe farmer:

The regression analysis on household income reveals several key factors influencing income levels. The access to credit variable has a positive and statistically significant relationship with income, with a coefficient of 0.17. This suggests that households with access to credit tend to have higher incomes, possiblydue to the ability to invest in income-generating activities like agricultural improvements or small businesses. Similarly, education level is positively correlated with income, with a coefficient of 0.04, indicatingthathighereducation levels enableindividuals to securebetter-paying jobs. The relationship between access to irrigation and income is also positive, with a coefficient of0.09, suggestingthat access to irrigation allows formoreproductiveand reliable farming, which in turn boosts income. The landholding size variable shows a significant positive relationship with income, with a coefficient of 0.18, indicatingthat larger landholdings provide more opportunities for income generation, whether through crop production or other agricultural activities. Finally, crop diversification is a strong positive predictor of income, with a coefficient of 0.72, showing that householdsinvolvedina varietyofagriculturalactivitiestendtohavehigherincomes, likely due to risk mitigation and multiple income streams.

Multipleregressionanalysisonexpenditureofthefarmer:

In terms of household expenditure, the analysis reveals that education level,household size, landholding size, and crop diversification significantly impact household spending. A positive coefficient of 0.01 for education level suggests that more educated households tend to spend slightly more, likely due to better financial planning and the ability to access higher-quality goods and services. Household size, with a significant coefficient of 0.019, also plays a crucial role, indicating that larger households require more resources and thus tend to spend more on food, healthcare, andotheressentials.Theanalysisshowsthathouseholdswithlargerlandholdingstend to spend less, with a negative coefficient of -0.107. This could be attributed to theself-sufficiency that comes with larger landholdings, reducing the need to purchase external food or goods. Additionally, crop diversification is positively related to expenditure, with a coefficient of 0.02, indicating that households engaged in diverse agriculturalpracticestendtospendmore,possiblybecausetheincomegeneratedfrom various crops allows for greater consumption flexibility.

8. PolicySuggestions:

1. Introduce subsidized loans or microfinance options specifically targeted at smallholder farmers. These should be designed to meet the financial needs of farmers without excessive interest rates. Expand crop insurance schemes, especiallyfortribalfarmers,toprotectagainstcropfailureduetonaturaldisasters. Simplify claim processes to make them more accessible.
2. Develop farmer education programs focusing on modern farming techniques, pest management, and post-harvest handling to increase productivity. These programs should be tailored to both tribal and non-tribal communities with a focus on inclusivity. In tribal areas, where education levels are lower, focus on basic literacy and vocational skill training to improve income-generating opportunities for rural youth and women.
3. Strengthen market access for farmers, particularly in remote areas, by creating more farmer markets or mandis. Support the development of direct marketing channels where farmers can sell their products without intermediaries.Supportthe establishment of value-added processing units for agricultural products like fruits, vegetables, and grains. This could include processing facilities for making pickles, jams, or flour, which could increase farmers' incomes.

4. Improve rural transport infrastructure, includingbetter roads and storage facilities, to reduce post-harvest losses and improve market access. Build cold storage facilities to reduce post-harvest losses, particularly for perishable crops like fruits and vegetables, which would help farmers maintain better price control.
5. The government should take necessary steps to indicate the farmers regarding the crop diversification, then the farmers income levels will be high.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study emphasizes the importance of crop diversification asa strategy for improving income and food security among small farmers in Coastal Andhra Pradesh. The research highlights the need for targeted policy measures, such as improved access to irrigation, credit facilities, agricultural training, and market infrastructure.Byaddressingtheuniquechallengesfacedbyfarmersinbothtribaland non-tribal areas, these interventions can promote more sustainable agricultural practices, reduce vulnerability to climate-related risks, and enhance the overall well- being of farming households. Moving forward, it is essential for future research to further explore the role of government policies, technological innovations, and community-based interventions in supporting crop diversification and fostering agricultural resilience in the region.

References:

1. Chowdary, B. R., Reddy, D. R., & Sharma, M. L. (2022). *Impact of crop diversification on small farmers' livelihoods in Coastal Andhra Pradesh: A case study*. Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development, 10(2), 45-58.
2. Government of Andhra Pradesh. (2020). *Agricultural statistics of Coastal Andhra Pradesh* [Report]. Directorate of Economics and Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.apagriculture.gov.in
3. Pattnaik, R., & Kumar, S. (2018). *Crop diversification in the tribal regions of India: Case studies from the Eastern Ghats.* Rural Development Journal, 14(3), 122-135.
4. Ravindra, M., &Raghavan, P. (2019). *Farmers' income and expenditure patterns: A regional perspective of Coastal Andhra Pradesh.* Agricultural Policy Review, 6(1), 57-69.

5. Sharma,S. N.,&Das, A. K.(2021). *Theeconomicsof cropdiversification in non-agency areas of Coastal Andhra Pradesh.* Indian Journal of Rural Studies, 39(1), 19-30.
6. World Bank. (2020). *Agricultural diversification and rural livelihoods in Coastal Andhra Pradesh.* World Bank Report. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/research
7. Bansal, R. K., & Gupta, S. (2019). *Sustainable agriculture and crop diversification in the Indian subcontinent: Challenges and prospects.* Environmental Economics and Policy Studies, 21(2), 245-267.
8. Chand, R. (2021). *Crop diversification in India: A review of policies and practices.* Economic & Political Weekly, 56(39), 29-41.
9. Dhar, S., & Pal, D. (2020). *The role of crop diversification in enhancing rural incomes in South India.* Agricultural Economics Research Review, 33(3), 53-65.
10. Gandhi,R.,&Reddy,G.S.(2018).*Impactofcropdiversificationonfood security in Coastal Andhra Pradesh.* Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 73(4),439-453.
11. Hegde, D., & Seshadri, M. (2022). *Assessment of land use and cropdiversification in rural India: Implications for policy.* Journal of Rural and Agricultural Development, 16(2), 102-114.
12. Kumar, R., & Yadav, A. K. (2019). *Crop diversification and its impact on smallholder farming systems: Evidence from Andhra Pradesh.* Indian Journal of Economics and Development, 37(4), 451-463.