

price and rainfall are having negative relation with production. These two variables express that a unit increase will decrease the cotton production. Therefore, the effect of price and rainfall is not observed on cotton production. From the coefficient of rainfall, cotton is cultivated more under irrigated area than the rainfed area. Finally, it is infer that the cotton production was responded by its area only. Market prices are not encouraging the cotton growers to rise the production.

The estimated coefficient of the equation (13), both the models gave the same results. Only the coefficient of the area expresses the significant and positive relation with the cotton production. Price factor reveals an insignificant positive relationship and the remaining variables lagged area, rainfall and lagged output having inverse relationship with the cotton production. Hence, the cotton production in Kurnool was responded by area only but not the prices. Therefore, the area is the major output determinant factor. A negligible price effect was noticed. More than 90 percent of cotton variation was recorded by these explanatory variables. The aggregate effect of the variables on cotton production is significant.

The cotton production in Kurnool District was mainly area responsive but not price responsive. Similarly, rainfall's effect on production is negative. The cotton output is mainly responded by irrigation factor. It may be suggested to rise the production in Kurnool by providing minimum support price, better marketing conditions, etc.

Considering Andhra Pradesh as a whole, it is observed that the cotton production was mainly affected by area only. But, in traditional relationship, cotton production in Andhra Pradesh was responded by its area and price. The remaining variables establish an insignificant positive relationship with cotton production. 57 percent of production variation was recorded by these variables and this variation is found to be significant.

7. REFERENCES

1. Archana Singh, and Srivastava, R.S.L. (2003). Growth and Instability in Sugarcane production in Uttar Pradesh: A Regional Study. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.58, No.2, April – June, pp. 279-282.
2. Daram Narain. (1965). Impact of Price Movements on Areas Under Selected Crops in India. 1900-1930, *Cambridge University press*, London.
3. Grewal, S.S., and Rangi, P.S. (1983). An Analytical Study of Growth of Punjab Agriculture. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*, Vol.XXXVIII, No.4, October-December, p.509.
4. Konda Swamy, A. (1985). Commercial Crops in India. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*, Vol.43, No.3, July-September, pp.185-198.
5. Sen, S.R. (1969). Growth and instability of Indian Agriculture. *An address to the twentieth conference of the Indian Society of Agriculture Statistics*, Jan 10-12.
6. Suresh Pal., and Sirohi, A.S. (1988). Source of Growth and Instability in the Production of Commercial Crops in India. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*, Vol.43, No.3, July-September, pp.456-463.