

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Resilient Rural Livelihood Pathways: Linking Climate-Resilient Agriculture, Women's Adaptive Capacity, And Productivity Upgrading in Small Manufacturing Enterprises

Dr. Sofia Mendel Rivera

School of Development Economics and Sustainability, University of Valparaíso, Chile

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue03 2026

PAGE: 08-15

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Management and Economics, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

## Abstract

**Background:** Rural development strategies are increasingly expected to address two pressures at once: climate risk that destabilizes agricultural incomes and productivity constraints that limit off-farm employment growth in small manufacturing enterprises. Climate shocks affect yields, water availability, migration patterns, and household labor allocation, weakening the rural economy's capacity to accumulate assets and invest in productivity upgrading (Kalra et al., 2007; Reilly, 1995; Hans et al., 2019). At the same time, evidence from manufacturing productivity research suggests that reforms, scale economies, and technology intensity interact with factor productivity trends in ways that can either broaden opportunities for small firms or concentrate gains among better-capitalized enterprises (Ahluwalia, 1991; Das, 2004; Pattnayak & Thangavelu, 2005).

**Objective:** This study develops a publication-ready, integrative research article that conceptually and analytically connects (i) climate-resilient agriculture and adaptation choices in smallholder systems, (ii) empowerment and capacity-building—especially for women—within adaptation and entrepreneurship, and (iii) productivity improvement mechanisms in small manufacturing enterprises as complementary pillars of sustainable rural development (Agarwal, 2018; Aryal et al., 2020; Korber & McNaughton, 2018).

**Methods:** Using an interpretive synthesis design, the study triangulates rural climate adaptation literature, resilience and entrepreneurship scholarship, and productivity measurement frameworks, drawing on frontier efficiency approaches and aggregate productivity concepts (Aigner et al., 1977; Battese & Coelli, 1992; OECD, 2001; Del Gatto et al., 2011).

**Results:** The synthesis identifies convergent mechanisms: (1) risk-reduction and information flows increase households' willingness to invest; (2) diversified rural employment reduces vulnerability to climate variability; (3) women's adaptive capacity strengthens community resilience and enterprise learning; and (4) productivity upgrading in small manufacturing depends on capability formation, policy regimes, and local demand linkages with climate-resilient agricultural transitions (Agarwal, 2018; Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022; Das, 2004; Unni et al., 2001).

**Conclusion:** Sustainable rural development is most robust when climate-resilient agriculture and small manufacturing productivity strategies are designed as an integrated "livelihood system," supported by empowerment, communication, and adaptation planning to reduce uncertainty and unlock investment in technology and skills (Gupta & Acharya, 2024; Lee et al., 2014; OECD, 2011).

**KEY WORDS**

climate resilience, rural livelihoods, small manufacturing, productivity, women's empowerment, adaptation planning, entrepreneurship.

**INTRODUCTION**

Rural development debates have moved decisively from single-sector thinking to system thinking: agriculture can no longer be treated as an isolated production domain, and small manufacturing can no longer be treated as an urban-only growth story. Climate change acts simultaneously on biophysical processes—temperature, rainfall, hydrology, pest dynamics—and on socioeconomic structures such as migration, labor markets, and household risk behavior (Kalra et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2018; Hans et al., 2019). When rainfall becomes more variable or heat stress intensifies, the effect is not limited to farm output; it extends to purchasing power, local demand for manufactured goods, willingness of households to invest, and the stability of supply chains that connect farms to rural enterprises (Aryal et al., 2020; Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012). This matters because sustainable rural development, at its core, is about the capacity of rural households and communities to build assets, expand capabilities, and maintain well-being under stress—economic and environmental (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Madhanagopal, 2023).

At the same time, productivity improvement remains central to long-run development. The conceptual foundation, often associated with the idea that growth in output cannot be explained solely by growth in inputs, underscores why technology, organization, and efficiency matter (Solow, 1957; OECD, 2001). In manufacturing—especially in the small enterprise segment—productivity is shaped by technology adoption, scale economies, labor organization, exposure to trade regimes, and policy reforms that alter incentives and competitive pressures (Ahluwalia, 1991; Das, 2004; Pattnayak & Thangavelu, 2005). However, productivity analysis also teaches a caution: observed productivity differences can reflect not only better technology but also differences in efficiency, measurement, and the broader environment in which firms operate (Del Gatto et al., 2011; OECD, 2009). If climate disruptions reduce market stability or increase input price volatility, rural firms—already constrained by finance and infrastructure—may struggle to invest in productivity upgrading even when reforms suggest growth opportunities (Unni et al., 2001; Unel, 2003).

This study positions climate-resilient agriculture and small manufacturing productivity improvement as mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable rural livelihoods. The key premise is that rural resilience emerges not merely from “better farming practices” but from a portfolio of livelihood strategies where agricultural adaptation, local enterprise dynamism, and social capability formation co-evolve (Aryal et al., 2020; Korber & McNaughton, 2018). Climate-resilient agriculture reduces downside risk and stabilizes incomes, which can raise the propensity to invest in off-farm microenterprises and manufacturing workshops. Conversely, more productive rural manufacturing expands employment options and buffers households against climate-driven income fluctuations, strengthening adaptive capacity (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Hans et al., 2019).

A central gap in many policy discussions is the tendency to treat “adaptation” as a set of technical measures and “productivity” as a sector-specific economic metric. Yet the adaptation literature emphasizes that communication, local planning, and community participation are essential to manage cascading risks and coordinate responses (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022; Gupta & Acharya, 2024). Meanwhile, productivity scholarship stresses that measurement and interpretation must be grounded in appropriate frameworks: distinguishing technical change from efficiency change, accounting for capital measurement, and understanding how policy regimes shape incentives for upgrading (Aigner et al., 1977; Battese & Coelli, 1992; OECD, 2009). By integrating these perspectives, the present article contributes a coherent analytical narrative for rural development strategy design.

The study also foregrounds gender and empowerment as non-negotiable components of resilience. Capacity-building for women is repeatedly linked to stronger community adaptation outcomes, because women’s participation influences information diffusion, risk coping, and the legitimacy of local institutions that implement adaptation measures (Agarwal, 2018). Additionally, climate policy can create “gendered spaces” through migration and adaptation processes, affecting who bears costs and who benefits (Hans et al., 2019). If rural enterprise development ignores these dynamics, productivity

gains may be uneven and resilience may weaken rather than strengthen.

Accordingly, the study is organized around four research objectives derived directly from the cited scholarship:

1. To explain how climate risks translate into household livelihood constraints and how adaptation options in smallholder systems can stabilize rural economies (Reilly, 1995; Kalra et al., 2007; Aryal et al., 2020).
2. To synthesize how empowerment and capacity-building—particularly for women—affect adaptation effectiveness and rural entrepreneurship potential (Agarwal, 2018; Hans et al., 2019; Korber & McNaughton, 2018).
3. To interpret small manufacturing productivity challenges through established productivity frameworks, including total factor productivity trends and frontier efficiency approaches (Solow, 1957; Ahluwalia, 1991; Aigner et al., 1977; Battese & Coelli, 1992; OECD, 2001).
4. To propose an integrated rural development logic that links climate-resilient agriculture and manufacturing productivity upgrading as a livelihood system rather than isolated sectors (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Lee et al., 2014; Gupta & Acharya, 2024).

## **METHODOLOGY**

This article uses a qualitative, interpretive synthesis methodology, designed for integrative theory-building across domains that typically use different analytical lenses: climate adaptation studies, rural livelihoods and resilience scholarship, and productivity measurement and growth accounting literature (Del Gatto et al., 2011; OECD, 2001). The method is intentionally text-based and conceptual because the present task is to generate a publication-ready article grounded strictly in the provided references without introducing external datasets or new empirical sources beyond those citations.

The synthesis follows three interlinked methodological moves.

First, conceptual extraction identifies the core claims each reference contributes to the rural development problem. Climate and agriculture studies articulate the pathways through which climate affects yields and livelihoods and outline adaptation options for smallholder systems (Reilly, 1995; Kalra et al., 2007; Aryal et al., 2020). Hydrology modeling work strengthens the understanding that climate risk is mediated through basin dynamics and water availability,

which are often decisive for rural production stability (Bhatta et al., 2019). Policy and planning references highlight institutional strategies such as resilience networks and local adaptation planning approaches (Gupta & Acharya, 2024; Lee et al., 2014). Resilience and entrepreneurship research provides interpretive categories for how communities and enterprises respond to shocks, emphasizing systematic relationships among stress exposure, resource mobilization, learning, and adaptation (Korber & McNaughton, 2018). Gender and migration work contributes critical insight into uneven burdens and differentiated capability access (Agarwal, 2018; Hans et al., 2019). Finally, productivity measurement and manufacturing growth studies contribute frameworks to interpret productivity change—whether as technological progress, efficiency improvement, scale effects, or policy-regime outcomes (Solow, 1957; Ahluwalia, 1991; Das, 2004; Pattanayak & Thangavelu, 2005; OECD, 2009).

Second, thematic coding clusters extracted concepts into five themes that connect agriculture and manufacturing within a rural livelihood system:

- (1) climate risk transmission and cascading effects;
- (2) adaptation options and local planning;
- (3) empowerment, gender, and social capability;
- (4) productivity measurement and enterprise upgrading mechanisms;
- (5) policy regimes and structural change linkages.

This thematic organization is anchored in explicit methodological and measurement guidance from productivity references, including the need to distinguish technical change from efficiency change when interpreting performance differences (Aigner et al., 1977; Battese & Coelli, 1992; OECD, 2001).

Third, integrative inference develops a coherent explanatory model in narrative form. Because the task prohibits equations and quantitative tables, the “model” is expressed as a descriptive logic: climate-resilient agriculture increases income stability and reduces risk, enabling households to invest; manufacturing productivity improvements expand employment and income diversity; empowerment and communication strengthen both adaptation effectiveness and enterprise learning; and policy regimes shape the speed and inclusiveness of these transitions (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022; Agarwal, 2018; Das, 2004; Unel, 2003; Gupta &

Acharya, 2024). The result is not presented as a mathematical formalization but as a structured interpretive framework consistent with the constraints and the nature of the provided sources (OECD, 2001; Del Gatto et al., 2011).

## **RESULTS**

The synthesis yields six major findings about how climate-resilient agriculture and small manufacturing productivity improvement can jointly advance sustainable rural development. Each finding is presented as a descriptive “result” of cross-source triangulation, with explicit citations for major claims.

**Finding 1:** Climate risk constrains rural development through compounding livelihood channels, not only yield loss.

The climate–agriculture literature emphasizes that climate change affects agriculture via temperature shifts, rainfall changes, and extreme events, which directly alter productivity and indirectly influence rural poverty and livelihoods (Reilly, 1995; Kalra et al., 2007; Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012). Yet the most important implication for integrated rural development is that climate risk triggers cascading effects beyond farming: household consumption is disrupted, migration decisions change labor availability, and local markets experience demand contraction or volatility (Hans et al., 2019; Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022). Communication research focused on cascading effects reinforces that climate impacts propagate through interconnected systems; when one component fails—such as water access or transport—multiple livelihood activities can be affected simultaneously (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022). This systemic view redefines adaptation: it is not merely agronomic improvement but rural economic stabilization.

**Finding 2:** Adaptation options are most effective when locally prioritized and institutionally supported.

Adaptation options for smallholder production systems in South Asia are described as context-dependent portfolios rather than single best practices; they include resource management, crop choices, and institutional arrangements that reduce vulnerability (Aryal et al., 2020). Priority-setting approaches for local adaptation strategy design emphasize participatory identification of risks and feasible actions, supporting the claim that adaptation effectiveness improves when local knowledge and constraints shape decisions (Lee et al., 2014). The CAP-RES and resilience-network perspective further supports the idea that institutional learning and

coordinated planning improve resilience outcomes and sustainability (Gupta & Acharya, 2024). Hydrological assessment work (SWAT applications) underscores that adaptation feasibility is constrained by basin dynamics, suggesting that climate-resilient agriculture must be coordinated with water governance to be durable (Bhatta et al., 2019). In practical terms, the “result” is that rural development programs should treat adaptation as an ongoing planning process rather than a one-time technical package (Lee et al., 2014; Gupta & Acharya, 2024).

**Finding 3:** Women’s capacity-building is not an “add-on”; it is a productivity and resilience mechanism.

Empowerment and capacity-building for women strengthens resilient communities by expanding the range of coping strategies, improving household decision-making, and supporting equitable participation in adaptation planning (Agarwal, 2018). Gendered spaces in climate policy, migration, and adaptation highlight that climate disruption can intensify unequal burdens, implying that resilience strategies ignoring gender can inadvertently weaken community adaptive capacity and increase vulnerability (Hans et al., 2019). The synthesis therefore treats women’s empowerment as a mechanism that improves both agricultural adaptation effectiveness and the capability base needed for enterprise development—skills, confidence, networks, and legitimacy in local institutions (Agarwal, 2018; Korber & McNaughton, 2018). If rural manufacturing is to absorb labor and provide stable incomes, it must be accessible to women through training, finance, and supportive norms, otherwise diversification benefits remain partial and fragile (Agarwal, 2018; Hans et al., 2019).

**Finding 4:** Rural manufacturing productivity constraints can be interpreted through established productivity frameworks that clarify “what is improving.”

Productivity measurement frameworks distinguish between output growth due to increased inputs and output growth due to improvements in efficiency, technology, or organization (Solow, 1957; OECD, 2001). Manufacturing productivity studies in India show that productivity patterns shift under varying trade and policy regimes, implying that small firms’ performance depends on how reforms change competitive conditions and access to technology (Das, 2004; Gangopadhyay & Wadhwa, 1998; Unni et al., 2001). The synthesis identifies that rural manufacturing often faces a “capability trap”: even when market opportunities exist, small

firms lack the capital measurement clarity and investment stability needed to upgrade tools, processes, and labor skills (OECD, 2009; Unel, 2003). The literature on sources of growth at the macro level supports that growth is multi-sourced—capital accumulation, labor, and productivity—and the rural relevance is that enterprise upgrading requires complementary investments: infrastructure, skills, and stable demand (Bosworth et al., 2007; OECD, 2011). Thus, productivity improvement in small manufacturing is not purely a factory-floor phenomenon; it is embedded in rural system conditions.

Finding 5: Efficiency analysis perspectives suggest that improving performance can mean reducing “distance from best practice,” not only innovating.

Frontier approaches were developed to separate random shocks from inefficiency and to interpret how far a producer is from a best-practice benchmark given inputs (Aigner et al., 1977). Application of frontier functions to agriculture demonstrates that technical efficiency and panel-data approaches can identify how producers perform relative to a frontier over time, reinforcing the idea that “improvement” can be achieved by better practices and management even before adopting new technologies (Battese & Coelli, 1992). The synthesis extends this interpretive logic to small manufacturing enterprises: many firms may improve productivity through operational efficiency—reduced downtime, better quality control, improved workforce organization—especially when capital constraints limit major technological leaps (Aigner et al., 1977; OECD, 2001). In rural contexts affected by climate shocks, reducing inefficiency is especially valuable because it increases output and income without necessarily requiring large new investments that households and small firms may hesitate to make under risk (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022).

Finding 6: Integrated livelihood resilience is strengthened by rural entrepreneurship and motivation, but only when embedded in supportive ecosystems.

Resilience and entrepreneurship scholarship emphasizes that entrepreneurial behavior is shaped by adversity and the ability to mobilize resources, learn, and adapt—suggesting that rural enterprise development can be resilience-enhancing if it is supported through institutions and networks (Korber & McNaughton, 2018). Educational research linking creativity and motivation to entrepreneurial intention implies that human capital and aspiration matter for enterprise creation

and upgrading, which is relevant when designing rural development programs that aim to stimulate micro-manufacturing alongside climate-resilient farming (Paliwal et al., 2022). However, the synthesis also highlights a constraint: entrepreneurship is not automatically inclusive. Without capacity-building—especially for women—and without adaptation planning that stabilizes income and reduces risk, entrepreneurial activity may be episodic or confined to households with higher initial assets (Agarwal, 2018; Lee et al., 2014). Therefore, rural entrepreneurship should be designed as part of an ecosystem: adaptation communication tools, local planning, and policy support that make upgrading feasible and sustained (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022; Gupta & Acharya, 2024).

## **DISCUSSION**

The integrated results have four major implications for theory, policy, and practice.

First, “sustainable rural development” should be conceptualized as a coupled productivity–resilience system.

Traditional approaches sometimes frame agriculture as the rural sector and manufacturing as an urban or peri-urban sector. Yet climate disruptions affect rural economies in a way that makes diversification essential for resilience (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Hans et al., 2019). Climate-resilient agriculture functions as a stabilizer: it reduces the variance of farm income and lowers the probability of distress sales or forced migration. Stabilization is developmentally important because investment in education, tools, and enterprise upgrading is more likely when households expect future returns and can tolerate short-term shocks (Aryal et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2014). Here, the climate literature’s emphasis on adaptation portfolios aligns naturally with productivity literature’s emphasis on multi-factor explanations: progress depends on complementary changes rather than single levers (OECD, 2001; Bosworth et al., 2007). The synthesis argues that rural development strategies should explicitly design for complementarities: resilient farming boosts demand stability and savings capacity; productive manufacturing provides off-farm employment and buffers climate income shocks. In this sense, the rural system becomes less “climate-sensitive” because income sources are diversified and reinforced by improved enterprise performance (Reilly, 1995; Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012).

Second, empowerment—especially women’s capacity-

building—should be treated as an economic mechanism, not only a justice goal.

Agarwal's focus on capacity building and empowerment identifies women's agency as a key to resilient communities (Agarwal, 2018). This is not merely normative; it is structurally linked to how households manage risk and allocate labor. When adaptation planning excludes women, information may not reach all household decision-makers, and community plans may fail to reflect constraints faced by those who manage water, food, and care responsibilities—areas that become more stressed under climate shocks (Agarwal, 2018; Hans et al., 2019). From a productivity perspective, exclusion reduces the effective labor pool and constrains entrepreneurship and microenterprise upgrading, weakening the diversification pathway that supports resilience (Korber & McNaughton, 2018). Gendered migration dynamics can further distort rural labor markets and caregiving burdens, making it harder for households to participate in training or enterprise work unless programs explicitly address these constraints (Hans et al., 2019). Therefore, empowerment is integral to "how" resilience and productivity gains become feasible at scale.

Third, productivity upgrading in small manufacturing should be framed as capability formation under risk, not only as technology adoption.

Manufacturing productivity studies in India show that trade regimes and reforms alter productivity patterns, sometimes improving growth but also creating pressures that small firms may struggle to meet (Das, 2004; Gangopadhyay & Wadhwa, 1998; Unni et al., 2001). A key interpretive insight from productivity measurement is that what appears as "low productivity" may reflect inefficiency, capital measurement issues, or lack of scale economies rather than absence of effort or demand (Del Gatto et al., 2011; OECD, 2009). Frontier approaches reinforce the idea that management and operational improvements can reduce the gap to best practice even before major capital deepening occurs (Aigner et al., 1977; Battese & Coelli, 1992). Under climate risk, this framing matters because households and small firms may delay irreversible investments. If programs offer only capital-intensive solutions, adoption may remain limited. By contrast, capability-building approaches—process improvement, quality practices, skill development—can generate early gains and build confidence to invest further, especially if agricultural adaptation stabilizes income and reduces perceived risk (Aryal

et al., 2020; Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012).

Fourth, communication and planning should be treated as "infrastructure" for adaptation and enterprise development.

Anand and Romo-Murphy highlight that communication tools can help manage cascading climate risks, implying that information systems and coordination mechanisms are critical for resilience (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022). Similarly, local adaptation strategy development through priority-setting underscores that planning is an iterative process that must coordinate constraints, opportunities, and stakeholder priorities (Lee et al., 2014). In integrated rural development, this "soft infrastructure" is what connects agriculture and manufacturing: it allows communities to anticipate shocks, coordinate water management, plan labor allocation, and maintain market functioning. Without such coordination, climate shocks can disrupt both farm production and enterprise operations, causing localized economic contractions. With coordinated planning, communities can reduce disruption and preserve the continuity needed for productivity upgrading—stable supply chains, predictable demand, and labor availability (Bhatta et al., 2019; Gupta & Acharya, 2024).

### **Limitations and future scope**

The study is intentionally limited to synthesis of provided references and does not present new primary empirical data. This means the proposed integrated framework should be empirically tested in specific rural contexts using panel data for firms and households, and by applying consistent productivity measurement standards for capital and labor (OECD, 2009; OECD, 2001). Future research could also explore how hydrological risk modeling interfaces with local enterprise risk management and how adaptation planning networks influence technology upgrading trajectories (Bhatta et al., 2019; Gupta & Acharya, 2024). Additionally, comparative work across regions would help identify whether the agriculture–manufacturing complementarity is strongest in certain structural conditions—market access, infrastructure, or policy regimes—consistent with the productivity literature's emphasis on context and measurement (Del Gatto et al., 2011; Das, 2004).

### **CONCLUSION**

Sustainable rural development under climate change requires more than "climate-smart agriculture" or isolated enterprise development programs. The synthesis presented here shows

that climate-resilient agriculture, empowerment and capacity-building (especially for women), and productivity upgrading in small manufacturing enterprises can be mutually reinforcing when designed as a coupled livelihood system (Agarwal, 2018; Aryal et al., 2020; Korber & McNaughton, 2018). Climate adaptation stabilizes rural incomes and reduces uncertainty, which increases the feasibility of investing in enterprise capabilities and productivity improvement (Ninan & Bedamatta, 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Manufacturing productivity upgrading expands off-farm employment and buffers households against climate variability, strengthening resilience and supporting sustained adaptation (Ahluwalia, 1991; Das, 2004; OECD, 2001). Effective integration depends on planning and communication tools that manage cascading risks and coordinate local priorities, and on policy regimes that enable inclusive access to skills, finance, and technology (Anand & Romo-Murphy, 2022; Gupta & Acharya, 2024; Unel, 2003). The core implication is strategic: rural development should be implemented as resilience-building through productivity—across sectors, across households, and across institutions—so that climate adaptation and economic upgrading become one coherent pathway rather than parallel, fragmented agendas (Bosworth et al., 2007; OECD, 2011).

## REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, B. (2018). Capacity building and empowerment of women in climate adaptation: A key to resilient communities. *Environmental Research and Sustainability*, 12, 214–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ers.2018.02.014>
2. Aigner, D., Lovell, C. A. K., & Schmidt, P. (1977). Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 6(1), 21–37.
3. Ahluwalia, I. J. (1991). *Productivity and growth in Indian manufacturing*. Oxford University Press.
4. Alam, A., & Rukhsana. (2023). Climate change impact, agriculture, and society: An overview. In A. Alam & Rukhsana (Eds.), *Climate change, agriculture and society*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28251-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28251-5_1)
5. Anand, A., & Romo-Murphy, E. (2022). Communication tools to tackle cascading effects of climate change: Evidence from Eastern Bihar, India. In *Climate change and risk in South and Southeast Asia*. Routledge.
6. Aryal, J. P., Sapkota, T. B., Khurana, R., Khatri-Chhetri, A., Rahut, D. B., & Jat, M. L. (2020). Climate change and agriculture in South Asia: Adaptation options in smallholder production systems. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 22, 5045–5075. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-019-00414-4>
7. Battese, G. E., & Coelli, T. J. (1992). Frontier production functions, technical efficiency and panel data: With application to paddy farmers in India. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 3, 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00158774>
8. Bhatta, B., Shrestha, S., Shrestha, P. K., & Talchabhadel, R. (2019). Evaluation and application of a SWAT model to assess the climate change impact on the hydrology of the Himalayan River Basin. *Catena*, 181, 104082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2019.104082>
9. Bosworth, B., Collins, S. M., & Virmani, A. (2007). Sources of growth in the Indian economy (NBER Working Paper No. 12901). National Bureau of Economic Research.
10. Canton, H. (2021). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—FAO. In *The Europa directory of international organizations 2021 (23rd ed.)*. Routledge.
11. Carter, C., Cui, X., Ghanem, D., & Mérel, P. (2018). Identifying the economic impacts of climate change on agriculture. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 10, 361–380.
12. Das, D. K. (2004). Manufacturing productivity under varying trade regimes, 1980–2000. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(5), 423–433.
13. Del Gatto, M., Di Liberto, A., & Petraglia, C. (2011). Measuring productivity. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 25(5), 952–1008.
14. Dholakia, B. H., & Dholakia, R. H. (1994). Total factor productivity growth in Indian manufacturing. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3342–3344.
15. Felipe, J. (1997). Total factor productivity growth in East Asia: A critical survey (EDRC Report Series No. 65). Asian Development Bank.
16. Gangopadhyay, S., & Wadhwa, W. (1998). Economic reforms and labour. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33(22), L40–L48.
17. Goldar, B. (1986). *Productivity in Indian industry*. Allied

Publishers.

18. Goldar, B. (2000). Productivity growth in Indian manufacturing in the 1980s and 1990s. Institute of Economic Growth.
19. Government of India. (2016). Indiastat.com. Retrieved from <https://www.indiastat.com/>
20. Gupta, A. K., & Acharya, P. (2024). Adaptive planning for resilience and sustainability: Lessons from India—Project CAP-RES and network. In A. K. Gupta, A. Gupta, & P. Acharya (Eds.), *Disaster risk and management under climate change* (pp. 607–629). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-4105-6\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-4105-6_30)
21. Hans, A., Hazra, S., Das, S., & Patel, A. (2019). Encountering gendered spaces in climate change policy in India: Migration and adaptation. *Journal of Migration Affairs*, 2(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.36931/jma.2019.2.1.1-24>
22. Kalra, N., Chander, S., Pathak, H., Aggarwal, P. K., Gupta, N. C., Sehgal, M., & Chakraborty, D. (2007). Impacts of climate change on agriculture. *Outlook on Agriculture*, 36(2), 109–118. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000007781159903>
23. Korber, S., & McNaughton, R. B. (2018). Resilience and entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(7), 1129–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-10-2016-0356>
24. Lee, D. R., Edmeades, S., De Nys, E., McDonald, A., & Janssen, W. (2014). Developing local adaptation strategies for climate change in agriculture: A priority-setting approach with application to Latin America. *Global Environmental Change*, 29, 78–91.
25. Madhanagopal, D. (2023). Local adaptation to climate change in South India: Challenges and the future in the tsunami-hit coastal regions. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003187691>
26. Mijatović, D., Van Oudenhoven, F., Eyzaguirre, P., & Hodgkin, T. (2012). The role of agricultural biodiversity in strengthening resilience to climate change: Towards an analytical framework. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 11(2), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2012.691221>
27. Ninan, K. N., & Bedamatta, S. (2012). Climate change, agriculture, poverty and livelihoods: A status report. The Institute for Social and Economic Change.
28. OECD. (2001). *Measuring productivity: Measurement of aggregate and industry-level productivity growth*. OECD Publishing.
29. OECD. (2009). *Measuring capital* (2nd ed.). OECD Publishing.
30. OECD. (2011). *OECD science, technology and industry scoreboard 2011: ISIC Rev. 3 technology intensity definition*. OECD Publishing.
31. Paliwal, M., Rajak, B. K., Kumar, V., & Singh, S. (2022). Assessing the role of creativity and motivation to measure entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial intention. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(5), 854–874. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2021-0178>
32. Pattnayak, S. S., & Thangavelu, S. M. (2005). Economic reform and productivity growth in Indian manufacturing industries: An interaction of technical change and scale economies. *Economic Modelling*, 22(4), 601–615.
33. Pradhan, G., & Barik, K. (1998). Fluctuating total factor productivity in India: Evidence from selected polluting industries. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33(9), M25–M30.
34. Rama Rao, C. A., Raju, B. M. K., Rao, A. V. M. S., Rao, K. V., Ramachandran, K., Nagasree, K., & Sammi Reddy, K. (2018). Climate change impacts, adaptation and policy preferences: A snapshot of farmers' perceptions in India. *Policy Paper*, 1, 34.
35. Reilly, J. (1995). Climate change and global agriculture: Recent findings and issues. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 77(3), 727–733. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1243242>
36. Solow, R. M. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39(3), 312–320.
37. Unel, B. (2003). Productivity trends in India's manufacturing sector in the last two decades (Working Paper No. WP/03/22). International Monetary Fund.
38. Unni, J., Lalitha, N., & Rani, U. (2001). Economic reforms and productivity trends in Indian manufacturing. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36(41), 3914–3922.