International Scholars Journals

Global Journal of Food and Agricultural Sciences Vol. 9 (3), pp. 001-011, March, 2022. Available online at www.internationalscholarsjournals.org © International Scholars Journals

Author(s) retain the copyright of this article

Full Length Research Paper

Who is technically efficient in Crop Production in Tigray Region, Ethiopia? Stochastic Frontier Approach

Shumet Asefa,

Department of Economics, Wollega University,Ethiopia.
E-mail:shumetasefa@gmail.com; Tel: +251913486802

Accepted 30 August, 2021

This paper provides new estimates of small holder farmers' technical efficiency and its principal determinants using a rural Tigray micro finance survey data collected in 2009. Both descriptive and econometric methods are used. The hypotheses tests confirm the adequacy of Cobb-Douglas over Translog frontier; the appropriateness of using SFA over OLS; the joint statistical significance of inefficiency effects; the appropriateness of using truncated normal distribution for one sided error; and the increasing returns to scale nature of the stochastic production function. The maximum likelihood parameter estimates showed that except labor all input variables have positive and significant effect on production. The results reveal that number of oxen owne d has the highest elasticity, then land, followed by labor and value of farm equipment. The analysis shows t h a t the mean technical efficiency of farmers is 60.38% implying that output in the study area can be increased by 39.62% at the existing level of inputs and current technology by operating at full technical efficient level. The estimated stochastic frontier production function revealed that all determinants (except households' sex, farm size, participation in irrigation, and member to association) have significant effect on efficiency of farmers. The sign of coefficients of determinants is found as the expected, except households' sex. Education of household heads, family literacy, family size, share cropping, credit access, crop diversification, and land fertility are found to enhance efficiency. In contrast, Households' age, dependency ratio, livestock size, and off-farm activity are found to increase inefficiency.

Key words: Ethiopia, Agriculture, Ethiopia, Smallholder Farmers, Technical Efficiency, Tigray.

INTRODUCTION

Empirical studies on the analysis of efficiency of smallholder farmers have been influenced by Schultz's (1964) 'poor-but-efficient hypothesis'. If smallholder farmers in backward agricultural settings are reasonably efficient, as advocated by Schultz, then increase in productivity will require new technologies to shift the production frontier upward. However, this is true when they produce under the same conditions and have enough time to aware the new technologies. This implies that after the introduction of new technologies, it may take a long time before they adopt and learn to use the technologies efficiently. As a result, this hypothesis has brought much debate in Sub-Saharan Africa (Owuor and Shem, 2009).

Currently Ethiopia is the second most populous country in Africa, with a population of almost 74 million and growing at a rate of 2.5% per annum (CSA, 2008). According to World Food Program (2009) economic growth of the country highly depends on the agricultural sector, which accounts for 47% of the GDP and more than 90% of exports, and 83% of the total employment, followed by the service and the manufacturing sectors with a share of 39% and 14% of GDP, respectively. The agriculture sector in Ethiopia is highly dependent on rain-fall and thus more vulnerable to weather shocks. Extreme dependence on traditional technology, rain-fed agriculture, poor supplementary services such as access to extension, credit, marketing, and infrastructure, and poor agricultural policies have been the principal causes of food insecurity in Ethiopia.

In spite of the potential benefits that may be gained by proper identification of the extent, causes and possible remedies of technical inefficiency of farmers, available evidence shows that little attention has been given to a systematic analysis of the efficiency of resource use in Ethiopian in general and in the study area in particular. Therefore, such studies will benefit farmers as policy intervention may need to have prior information whether to continue with the existing technology by improving the efficiency of less efficient farmers or to introduce a new technology so as to increase crop production in the study area.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Although agriculture still remains to be the back bone for Ethiopian economy, its performance has been unsatisfactory and unable to fulfill the growing food demand as result of high population growth. Now a day this decline in productivity has been given due attention in the national development efforts. However, because of the influential 'poor-but-efficient hypothesis' of Schultz (1964) resources have been concerned mainly with increasing the productivity of agriculture sector by the introducing and adopting new technologies.

Now a day in Ethiopia there has been increasing focus by policy-makers on investments on modern technologies rather than efforts targeted at improving the efficiency of inefficient farmers. Theoretically, introducing modern technologies can increase agricultural productivity and production. However, in areas where there is inefficiency in which the existing inputs and technologies are not efficiently utilized trying to introduce new technologies may not have the expected results. Obviously, the level of farmers' technical efficiency has paramount implications for country's choice of development strategy (Zenebe et.al, 2005).

In Ethiopia, researches on technical efficiency of smallholder agriculture are not extensive, and the findings or conclusions of some of them are not consistent with one another. Therefore, policy implications drawn from some of the above empirical works may not allow in designing area specific policies to be compatible with its socio-economic as well as agro-ecologic conditions and the results of some of the studies may not allow to make comparative analysis of farmers' efficiency across tabias Tabia is local administrative area equivalent to Kebele. Theref ore, this study intends to fill these gaps.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study is to make analysis of technical efficiency of smallholder farmers with the aim of providing information to policy makers whether to continue with the existing technology by improving the efficiency of less efficient farmers or to introduce a new technology so as to increase crop production in the study area.

HYPOTHESES

Smallholder farmers are characterized by heterogeneity in various aspects of livelihoods like differences in resource endowments, knowledge of farming practices, and other socio- economic factors which could lead to difference in their technical efficiency. The following hypotheses can be tested using the generalized likelihood ratio test: LR = -2[L (H0)-L (H1)], where L (H0) and L (H1) are the values of log likelihood functions under the null and alterative hypothesis, respectively (Greene, 1980). The null hypothesis is rejected when the calculated chi-square is greater than the critical chi-square with degree of freedom (the number of parameters equal to zero at null hypothesis) i.e. $LR > \chi C^2$ (Kodde and Palm, 1986).

1. The hypothesis that identifies the appropriate functional form that can adequately represent the data is tested.
2. The hypothesis that shows the appropriateness of employing stochastic frontier model over ordinary least square is tested.
3. The hypothesis that specifies whether the technical inefficiency effects are jointly significant or not is tested.
4. The hypothesis that specifies whether the half-normal distributional assumption of inefficiency effect is appropriate or nor is tested.
5. The hypothesis that specifies whether the stochastic frontier production function is characterized by constant returns to scale or not is tested.

Significance of The Study

The ability of farmers to adopt modern agricultural technologies and achieve sustainable food crop production depends on their level of technical efficiency. Technical Efficiency measurement in developing countries is very important because it is another important source for productivity growth (Al-hassan, 2008).Especially in areas where resources are scarce; making such analysis is highly crucial to improve agricultural production and productivity without injecting new investment on modern technologies. An empirical investigation of farm specific technical efficiency and its principal determinants will help policy makers as well as development endeavors to determine the level to which farmers are using the existing technologies efficiently and whether it is possible to raise productivity by improving technical efficiency with the given technology or to develop and adopt new technologies to raise agricultural productivity. Finally, the study will hopefully serve as a base for further and detailed study in the study area in particular and in the region in general.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Agriculture in Ethiopia is characterized by mixed farming system. In both high and mid altitude areas, livestock husbandry is an integral part of crop husbandry. Within the mixed farming type, cereal crops account for about three–fourth of the planted area; while the remaining cultivated area is devoted to the production of other annual and perennial crops such as pulses, oil crops and coffee. Extensive livestock production in the arid and semi– arid areas is also a common feature of the sector. Crop production differs from one region to other due to the existence of significant differences in rainfall, temperature, soil types, and market access. The majority of smallholder farmers grow food crops (USDA (2009).

According to CSA (2008) most agricultural producers are subsistence farmers with small land holdings having the nature of fragmentation. Majority of small holding farmers in Ethiopia live in highlands. There are two main soil types in the highland agro-ecologic type of the country. The first type is reddish-brown clayey that can hold moisture and are well endowed with needed minerals, with the exception of phosphorus. The second type is a brownish-to-gray and black soils with high clay content. These soil types have great agricultural potential in the country.

Most of the empirical works on the efficiency of small holder farmers have been triggered by Schultz's (1964) 'poor-but-efficient hypothesis'. According to Schultz (1964) small holder farmers in backward agricultural settings are poor but efficient in allocating their resources. If farmers are efficient, then increase in productivity will require new inputs and technology so as to shift the production frontier upward. In addition, there is a possibility to enhance productivity through more efficient use of farmers' resources with the given technology (Zenebe.et.al, 2005).

The classical theory of production is based on the notion that firms are efficient and any actual output variation from the frontier is due to external shocks which is entirely beyond the control of the decision makers. According to neo-classical theory of production different producers can produce different levels of output even if they use the same level of inputs and technology. The difference in observed outputs from the frontier among producers can be explained not only from external shocks but also through differences in efficiency of using the existing resources.

Technical efficiency measures the relative ability of the farmers to get the maximum possible output at a given level of input or set of inputs. Technically efficient farmers are those that operate on the production frontier which represents maximum output attainable from each input level. All feasible points below the frontier are technically inefficient points. According to Ellis (1988) technical efficiency is the extent to which the maximum possible output is produced from a given set of inputs. On the other hand, a producer is said to be allocatively efficient if production occurs in a set of economic region of the production possibility set. Thus, if a farmer has achieved both technical and allocative efficiencies, then the farmer can be said economically efficient.

Since Farrell's (1957), there was a growing demand in developing methodologies to be applied for measurement of efficiency. Early methodologies were deterministic frontier models which attribute all deviations from maximum possible output only to inefficiency. However, recent improvement on early methodologies has made it possible to separately account for factors beyond and within the control of decision makers such that only the latter that causes inefficiency. Developments in production frontier have been an attempt to measure productive efficiency. The production frontier shows the range of maximum possible output levels and identifies the extent to which the farmer lies below or on the frontier.

Productivity shows the ability of the farmer to produce a given quantity of output (it may not be maximum possible output) from the given level of inputs. Hence productivity does not show the relative performance of farmer in producing maximum possible output f rom the given set of inputs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sources and Methods of Data Collection

The research site is located in the Geba catchment with in Tigray region. The site covers 4600 km^2 area, 10 Woredas and 168 Tabias. To reflect the contrasting agro-climatic zones of the site four woredas were selected. One tabia was randomly selected from each woreda. The four survey tabias are Arato from Enderta woreda of Southern zone; Rubafeleg and Tsenkanite are from Hawzien and Atsbi woredas of the Eastern zone respectively; Siye is from Tanqua Abergelle of the central zone.83 observations from Arato, 79 observations from Rubafelg, 87 observations from Tsenkanite and 77 observations from Siye were randomly sampled .

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The variation of actual output from the frontier due to inefficiency and random shocks can be captured through stochastic frontier approach .The existence of inefficiency in crop production comes from inefficient use of scarce resources. There exist two main competing methods for analyzing technical efficiency and its principal determinants: the parametric frontier (stochastic frontier approach) and the non-parametric frontier (data envelopment analysis). Non-parametric frontier suffers from the criticism that it takes no account of the possible influence of random shocks like measurement errors and other noises in the data (Coelli, 1995).

The parametric frontier uses econometrics method to estimate the parameters of both stochastic frontier production function and inefficiency effect model. The biggest advantage of stochastic frontier approach is the introduction of stochastic random noises that are beyond the control of the farmers in addition to the inefficiency effects. The disadvantage of this approach is that it imposes explicit restriction on functional forms and distributional assumption for one-sided error term (Battese and Coelli, 1995).In opposite to the stochastic frontier method, data envelopment analysis is a deterministic frontier, meaning that all deviation from the frontier is attributed to inefficiency only. It is difficult to accept this assumption, given the inherent variability of agricultural production in developing countries due to a lot of exogenous factors like weather shocks, pests, diseases, etc (Coelli and Battese,1995).Furthermore, because of the low level of education of farmers in developing countries, keeping accurate records is not a common practice. Thus, most available data on production are more likely to be subject to measurement errors. As a result of above argument, this study employs a stochastic frontier approach introduced by Aigner et.al (1977), and Meeusen and Van den Broeck (1977).

Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier production function

The stochastic frontier production function that assumed Cobb-Douglas form is given as:

$$\ln q = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln ld + \beta_2 \ln ox + \beta_3 \ln lb + \beta_4 \ln feqpt + \beta_5 arato + \beta_6 siye + \beta_7 tsenkanet + v_i - u_i \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots(1)$$

Where: βi's are parameters denoted the coefficient of inputs to be estimated by maximum likelihood estimation method (MLE). Here they refer to output elasticity for inputs. ln is natural logarithm; q-is the value of output produced by i^{th} farmer; ld- is the total crop area cultivated in 'tsimad'; lb- is the total labor days spent on farm; ox– is the total oxen days used; feqpt-is the total value of farm equipments owned; while arato, siye, and tsenkanet are the name of tabia which take value one if households live in there, zero otherwise. The choice of these convectional inputs is made because these inputs are very important which are commonly used for crop production in the study area.vi - is the random variable assumed to be independently, identically, and normally distributed (iid) N $(0, \sigma^2 v)$; and ui - is a non-negative random variable assumed to be independently and identically distributed (iid) N $(\mu, \sigma^2 u)$.

Sources of Technical Inefficiency

The level of technical efficiency is estimated as:

$$TE_i = \frac{Y_i}{Y_i^*} = \frac{F(x_i,\beta_i)\exp(\varepsilon_i)}{F(x_i,\beta_i)\exp(v_i)} = \exp(-u_i) \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots(2)$$

Where Yi is the actual output while Y_i^* is the frontier output or the maximum potential output. To test whether technical inefficiency effect is absent and hence the conventional production function is more appropriate or not than stochastic frontier approach, the study uses the generalized likelihood-ratio test .The results these hypothesis tests are presented in the result and discussion part. For the inefficiency effect model, the household specific factors are assumed to linearly affect farm technical inefficiency. Given the specification of the stochastic frontier production function, as defined by equations (1), the technical inefficiency effect of the i^{th} farmer is given as:

$$U_i = \delta_0 + \delta_1 Z_{1i} + \delta_2 Z_{2i} + \delta_3 Z_{3i} + \delta_4 Z_{4i} + \delta_5 Z_{5i} + \delta_6 Z_{6i} + \delta_7 Z_{7i} + \delta_8 Z_{8i} + \delta_9 Z_{9i} + \delta_{10} Z_{10i} + \delta_{11} Z_{11i} + \delta_{12} Z_{12i} + \delta_{13} Z_{13i} + \delta_{14} Z_{14i} + \delta_{15} Z_{15i} + \delta_{16} Z_{16i} + \delta_{17} Z_{17i} + W_i \quad \ldots\ldots(3)$$

Where δi's are parameters denoted the coefficient of technical inefficiency effects. Here negative and positive signs of the parameters reveal that they can increase and decrease farmer's technical efficiency, respectively. wi=unobserved random error term; i = number of farmers (1-326 sample respondents). The ML estimates of technical inefficiency effect model given above can be estimated using a software package FRONTIER VERSION

4.1(Coelli, 1996), which is specifically designed for the estimation of efficiency. ui is non-negative random variable, assumed to be independently and identically distributed (i.i.d) with truncated-normal distribution N (μ, σ^2u) (Stevenson, 1980) where μ>0 i.e. u≥ 0 reflects the level of technical efficiency of farmers relative to the frontier.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

FINDINGS

Hypotheses stated in the model specification part and validity of the model which is used for analysis has to be tested before estimating the parameters of the model. One attractive feature of SFA is, it is possible to test various hypotheses , which are not possible in non-parametric model(Obwona,2006;Tedla,2002; Bakhsh,2007;and Thiam et.al.,2001). The following specification tests are performed using generalized likelihood ratio tests: LR[1] LR denotes log likelihood =-2[L (H0)-L (H1)], where L (H1) and L (H0) are the values of the log likelihood functions under the alternative and null hypothesis, respectively (Greene, 1980).

The first hypothesis testing is choosing the appropriate functional form for the data from the Cobb-Douglas and Translog frontier. The calculated likelihood ratio value (LR) equals to 33.72 while the critical likelihood ratio value (χC^2) at 22 degree of freedom at upper 1% level of significance equals to 37.6.Since the calculated LR value is less than the critical value of χ^2 at 22 degrees of freedom, not rejecting the null hypothesis at 1% level of significance implies that the Cobb Douglas functional form adequately captures the crop production behavior of farmers in the study area (Kodde and Palm, 1986).

The next hypothesis whether the SPF Stochastic Production Frontier is more appropriate than the convectional production function. The calculated likelihood ratio value (LR) equals to 78.85 while the critical likelihood ratio value (χC^2) at 1 degree of freedom with upper 1% level of significance equals to 6.63.Since the calculated LR value is greater than the critical value of χ^2 at 1 degrees of freedom, rejecting the null hypothesis implies that S P F is more appropriate than convectional production function or there is significant technical inefficiency variation among the smallholder farmers.

The third hypothesis is that the explanatory variables in technical inefficiency effect model are simultaneously equal to zero. The calculated value of LR equals to 30.86 while the critical likelihood ratio (χC^2) of upper 5 percent level of significance at 17 degree of freedom equals to 27.6.Since the calculated likelihood ratio , LR , value is greater than the critical value of LR , χC2, at 17 degree of freedom with upper 5 % level of significance, the null hypothesis that determinant variables in the inefficiency effect model are simultaneously equal to zero is rejected at 5 % level of significance. Therefore, the explanatory variables associated with inefficiency effect model are jointly different from zero. Hence these variables jointly explain inefficiency differences among the farmers.

The fourth hypothesis testing is for about the distributional assumption of the one sided error term. Given Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier production function best fits the data; the researcher tests hypothesis whether the technical efficiency level is better estimated using a half-normal (μ=0) or a truncated-normal distributional assumption of U_i (μ>0) using FRONTIER VERSION 4.1.This software is designed only for half -normal and truncated-normal distributional assumption for inefficiency effect. The calculated likelihood ratio value (LR) equals to 30.11 while the critical likelihood ratio value (χC^2) at 1 degree of freedom with upper 1% level of significance equals to 6.63.Since the calculated LR value is greater than the critical value of χ^2 at 1 degrees of freedom, rejecting the null hypothesis implies that truncated-normal distributional assumption of one sided error term is more appropriate for the farmers in the study area than half-normal.

The last hypothesis testing is the test for returns to scale. Thus, the log likelihood-ratio test is calculated to be 70.66 and when this value is compared to the critical value of χ^2 at 4 degrees of freedom with 1% level of significance equals to 13.28, the null hypothesis that the Cobb-Douglas production function is characterized by constant return to scale is strongly rejected. The sum of the partial elasticity of all inputs equals to 1.73.This means an increase in all inputs at the sample mean by one percent will increase crop production in the study area by 1.73 %. This reveals that the production function is characterized by increasing returns to scale.

STOCHASTIC FRONTIER PRODUCTION FUNCTION RESULTS

As already stated above, the present study employs one stage maximum likelihood estimation procedure to simultaneously estimate the parameters of both stochastic frontier production function and inefficiency effect model. The result reveals that all input variables, except labor, have significant effect on crop production in the study area. Contrary to the prior expectation, labor with positive sign turned out to be insignificant.

For the case of inefficiency effect model, all determinant variables except sex of household head, farm size, access to irrigation, and member to association are significantly responsible for technical efficiency variation among the farmers. The sign of coefficients of both input variables and inefficiency effects have been as prior expectation except sex of household head. Education of household head, literate members of household head, family size, participation in share cropping, credit access, crop diversification, and land fertility are found to enhance farmers' technical efficiency. In contrast, households' age, dependency ratio, livestock size, off-farm activities are found to increase technical inefficiency.

Given the Cobb-Douglas functional form used, stochastic frontier approach implemented, truncated normal distribution of the inefficient effect assumed, the mean technical efficiency is estimated to be 60.38% with minimum of 0.13% and maximum of 88.64%. This indicates that average technical efficiency of farmers in the study area is a little bit above the mid-way to the frontier. The estimated values of gamma (γ) of both functional forms (0.9378 in the case of Cobb-Douglas and 0.9070 in the case of Translog frontier) reveal the fact that farmers in the study area are technically inefficient and there is significant efficiency variation among the farmers. This again reveals the fact that most farmers in the study area are using their existing resources inefficiently.

Using the values of the actual output observed and the predicted technical efficiency scores of each sample farmer(for the case of C-D SFPF Stochastic Production Frontier), the potential output is estimated for each farmer in Birr. The mean value of the actual output and the mean value of the potential output are 1383.549 Birr and 2291.40 Birr, respectively. 93.78% of this output variation is due to variation in technical efficiency among the farmers while the remaining 6.22 % is due to statistical noises which are not under the control of the farmers. This shows that there is wider room for rising crop production in the study area by improving the efficiency of inefficient farmers without undertaking additional investment on modern agricultural technology, given the fact that technical efficiency of farmers is directly related to the overall productivity of the agricultural sector.

As far as the frequency distribution of technical efficiency estimates of households is concerned, nearly 36.2% of the farmers having efficiency score below the mean 0.60; the remaining 54.6% of the farmers have efficiency scores ranging from 0.60 to 0.80; and only 9.2% of the respondent farmers having efficiency score above 0.80. The distribution of the technical efficiency scores clearly shows that it is skewed heavily in the range of 0.60 to 0.80, representing more than half of the sample farmers. The wide variation in technical efficiency is an indication that most of the farmers in the study area are still using their resources inefficiently in the production process and there still exists opportunities for rising their crop production by improving their current level of technical efficiency.

Variables that are considered as principal determinants of technical efficiency can be categorized into three such as demographic characteristics (sex, age, education of household head, number of literate family members, family size, dependency ratio), resource factors (livestock size, farm size, and land fertility) and institutional and other associated factors (access to credit, participation in irrigation, members to association, off-farm activities, crop diversification etc). Households' sex ,access to irrigation, farm size ,and members to association have not been found to explain the argument why some farmers are technically more efficient while others are technically less efficient, although their signs are as expected except sex. Greater attention has to be given during interpretation of the signs of coefficients of technical inefficient effect. Positive sign of the coefficient of one variable shows the negative effect of that variable on technical efficiency. The opposite is true for negative sign of the coefficient of the variable. This is because the dependent variable is technical inefficiency not technical efficiency of the farmers.

Demographic Characteristics

*Age of Household Head***:** Age and age square have been found to be significant variables in explaining the variation in technical efficiency among farmers

.Age of the head of household, which is considered as a proxy of farmers' experience in farming, is hypothesized to have positive effect on efficiency. The result also supports the hypothesis that age and age square have positive and negative significant effect (at 5% and 10 % level of significance, respectively) on inefficiency. This is because as age increases farming experiences increases so that efficiency increases. But after certain age interval it will have negative effect on efficiency because of older farmers are thought to be more conservative in implementing modern technologies. This means that age and efficiency have inverted u-shaped relationship i.e. efficiency increases with age up to some point and then decreases with rise in age. Hence, middle aged farmers are more efficient than old aged and younger farmers. Since farming like any other professions needs accumulated knowledge, skill and physical capability, age of the farmers is decisive in determining efficiency. The knowledge, the skills as well as the physical capability of farmers is likely to increase as age increases. However this tends to decrease after a certain age level. Older farmers will have less physical capacity to undertake their farming activities efficiently. This finding is consistent with work of Chirwa (2007).

*Education of household head***:** It is hypothesized that educated household head would be able to have higher technical efficiency from the given level of inputs than their illiterate counterpart. The result also supports the hypothesis that education of household head has been found to be significant variable (at 1% level of significance) to enhance efficiency of farmers. This is because education can increase their information acquisition and adjustment abilities, thereby- increasing their decision making capacity. In addition to this it will help them to adopt modern agricultural technologies and be able to produce higher output using the existing recourses more efficiently.

Family s i z e : The number of persons living in the household is hypothesized to determine efficiency positively. The result shows that family size has positive and significant effect (at 10% level of significance) on efficiency. This means that households with large family size would manage crop plots on time than their counterparts. This is because at the time of peak seasons, there is shortage of labor. This is possible since more labor can be deployed during peak season in order to timely undertake the necessary farming activities like ploughing, weeding and harvesting that raise efficiency.

*Literate members of household heads***:** Number of literate of family members is hypothesized to have positive effect on technical efficiency. The result also shows that literacy of family members is found to be significant variable (at 1% level of significance) for determination of farmers' efficiency. It has positive and significant effect on efficiency. As the education level of family members' increase it is expected to increase their information acquisition and adjustment abilities, thereby- increasing their decision making capacity by which their attitude will be shaped on in adopting modern agricultural technologies that increase farmer's efficiency. Therefore, households with more literate family members are expected to have better efficiency than their counterparts.

Dependency Ratio: Household with high dependency ratio is hypothesized to be less efficient than his counter parts. The result also shows that dependency ratio has negative and significant effect (at 1% level of significance) on efficiency. This reveals those households with high dependency ratio is more likely to be less efficient than those with low dependency ratio. This is due to the reason that as the number of dependent family members (economically inactive) increase the household would have to allocate more financial resources to their health, education and other expenses so that less resources might remain for production purposes (may not be able to use improved inputs). In other words since family size is controlled higher dependency ratio means less productive workers which results more consumption and less production. As a result of this households couldn't afford to use improved agricultural technologies like fertilizers, improved seed varieties etc due to liquidity constraints.

Resource Endowment Factors

Livestock size: The result shows that the value of livestock owned is found to be negative and significant (at 1% level of significance) in determining efficiency variation among the farmers. It is obvious that the crop husbandry is highly supplemented and complemented by the animal husbandry. It has systematic effect on efficiency i.e. the farmer who possesses more number of livestock will have more money to purchase agricultural inputs, and again has the chance to get oxen for draught power. Since all types of animals, poultry and beehive production are considered in this study, livestock competitive effect has dominated its supplementary effect. This might be due to the reason that farmers who held more livestock may tend to give their due attention to livestock production and hence crop production may be lagged behind it.

Land fertility: It is hypothesized that f a r m e r s w i t h fertile lands are more efficient than their counterparts. The result also supports the hypothesis that land fertility is found to have positive and significant effect (at 5% level of significance) on efficiency. This is because fertile lands are expected to increase productivity. A farmer endowed with fertile land will be more technically efficient than infertile lands. This is in line with other empirical findings like Chirwa (2007).

Institutional and Other Associated Factors

Access to credit: It is hypothesized that households who have got credit access is more efficient than their counter parts. The result shows that credit access is found to have positive and significant effect (at 5% level of significance) on farmers' technical efficiency in production. This implies that credit availability shifts the cash constraint outwards and thus enables farmers to make timely purchases of inputs that they cannot afford otherwise from their own resources and enhances the use of agricultural inputs that leads to higher efficiency**.** This result is consistent with other empirical works like Kinde (2005) and Gebrehawaria (2008), although for irrigated plots only.

Off-farm activity: The result reveals that off-farm activity has negative and significant effect (at 1% level of significance) on farmers' efficiency. Of course being involved in off/non- farm activities may have a systematic effect on the technical efficiency of farmers. This is because farmers may allocate more of their time to off/non-farm activities and thus may lag in agricultural activities. On the other hand, incomes from off/ non-farm activities may be used as extra cash to buy agricultural inputs and can also improve risk management capacity of farmers. However, the result shows that agricultural lag effect of off-farm activity has dominated its income effect. This result is consistent with other empirical works like Obwona (2006), Kibaara (2005), and Chirwa(2007) .

Crop diversification: It is hypothesized that a farmer engaged in crop diversification is more efficient than his/her counterpart. Beside for commercialization, it is used as risk minimization during crop failure. The result also shows that crop diversification has positive and significant effect on farmers' efficiency (at 1% level of significance). This is due to the reason that farmer engaged in crop diversification is more efficient in allocating their resources like labor and land than his/her counterpart.

Share cropping: It is hypothesized that farmers tend to be less efficient in managing those lands that are owned or rented in than sharecropped. Supporting the hypothesis, the result shows that sharecropping is found to have positive and significant effect (at 5% level of significance) on efficiency. This might be due to the reason that sharecropping may motivate the tenants to work hard to meet their contractual obligations. They may do so because outputs that will be obtained from sharecropped i n lands are eventually shared between the land owner and the tenant. Therefore, farmers are expected to give priority to their share cropped land than t o their own or hired lands. In other words, farmers who are managing either their own lands or hired lands are less efficient than those farmers who are managing sharecropped lands.This result is in line with the result of Bakhsh (2007) and Chirwa(2008).

CONCLUSION

Hypotheses tests revealed the adequacy of Cobb-Douglas frontier over Translog frontier for the data; the appropriateness of using stochastic frontier production function over convectional production function; the joint statistical significance of inefficiency effects; the appropriateness of using truncated-normal distribution assumption for one sided error term; and the increasing returns to scale nature of the stochastic frontier production function.

Using one step maximum likelihood estimation procedure, the parameters of both Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier production function and technical inefficiency effect model are estimated simultaneously. Hence, results show that except labor all input variables have significant effect on crop production in the study area and number of oxen owned has the highest elasticity, then land, followed by labor, and value of farm equipment with value of 1, 0.36, 0.21, and 0.16, respectively. This is an indicative of the importance of traditional inputs in subsistence agriculture. This implies that enhanced access and better use of conventional inputs like ox and land could lead to higher crop production in the study area.

The empirical findings show that the predicted efficiencies vary widely among the sample farmers with a mean technical efficiency value of 0.6038. This indicates that it is little bit above the mid-way to the frontier. The significant value of gamma, 0.9378, reveals the fact that a high level of technical inefficiency exists among the sampled farmers. The wide variation in technical efficiency is an indication that most of the farmers are still using their resources inefficiently in the production process and there still exists opportunities for increasing their crop production by improving their current level of technical efficiency. Hence, production in the study area can be increased by 39.62% at the existing level of inputs and current technology by operating at full technical efficient level.

RECOMMENDATION

The attention of policy makers to mitigate the existing level of food deficiency and poverty by improving agricultural productivity should not stick only to the introduction and dissemination of modern agricultural technologies but they should also give due attention towards improving the existing level of inefficiency of farmers. The argument here is that improvements in the agricultural productivity in the use of modern technologies are expensive, require relatively longer time to achieve and farmers have serious financial problems to afford them. Moreover, the result of increment of productivity and production of agricultural sector by using improved technologies will be high if it is coupled with the improvement of the existing level of inefficiency of farmers. Since the existence of higher inefficiency and the principal factors that are responsible for the efficiency variation among the farmers have important policy implications so as to mitigate the existing level of inefficiency of farmers in the study area, the following policy recommendations have been drawn based on the results of the study.

The positive and higher elasticity of convectional inputs like ox, land, and farm equipments indicate the importance of traditional inputs in subsistence agriculture. This implies that enhanced access and better use of these conventional inputs could lead to higher crop production in the study area. Therefore, policy makers should made further efforts in strengthening financial institutions like micro finance and other arrangements that can relax farmers' liquidity constraints and help them to afford these traditional inputs.

It is observed that, in the study area, both education of household heads and family members is positively related to technical efficiency. Hence, any agricultural policy that would educate people through proper agricultural extension services would definitely lead to increase efficiency of the farmers there by agricultural productivity. Therefore, it is possible to r e c o m m e n d that the regional government sh oul d hav e a prime responsibility to keep on provision of education in these areas and others so that farmers can use the available inputs more efficiently under the existing technology.

Results indicate that land fertility is found to have positive and significant effect on efficiency. The policy implication is that improving and maintaining fertility status of land by applying improved land management practices would increase efficiency of farmers there by crop production. The result reveals that there is land shortage in the study area as a result of high population growth. Hence, early interventions are called for intensive and efficient use of land farming practice.

In conclusion, the existence of higher technical inefficiency in the study area indicates that integrated development efforts that will improve the existing level of input use and policy measures that will decrease the existing level of inefficiency of farmers will have great importance in improving the living standard of farmers at large. Given limited resources, it would be wise and obviously better for the government and other concerned parties (like NGOs) participating in developmental activities to encourage development endeavors towards improving the level of efficiency of the farmers in the study area to be cost effective as compared to introduction of new technologies. However, the continuation of technology development and its dissemination is indispensable and both ways of increasing productivity have to be followed, although priority should be given to the improvement of efficiency of inefficient farmers.

Scope for Further Research

The main emphasis of the study is technical efficiency which is one aspect of productive efficiency and might not necessary reflect the overall household efficiency. Therefore, future research needs to consider overall economic efficiency which will give a clear and full picture of productive efficiency of farmers in the study area.

REFERENCES

Aigner DJ, Lovell CAK, Schmidt P (1977). Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Production Function Models. Journal of Econometrics, 6, 21-37.

Ajibefun IA (2008). An Evaluation of Parametric and Non-parametric Methods of Technical Efficiency Measurement: Application to Small Scale Food Crop Production in Nigeria.

Arega DA, Rashid MH (2003). Measuring the Impact of Ethiopia's New Extension Program on the Productive Efficiency of Farmers, Department Of Agric. Econ.

Bakhsh K (2007).An Analysis of Technical Efficiency and Profitability of Growing Potato,Carrot, Radish, and Bitter Gourd: A Case Study of Pakistani Punjab.

Battese GE, Broca SS (1996). Functional Forms of Stochastic Production Functions & Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects: A Comparable Study of Wheat Farmers in Pakistan.CEPA Working Papers, No.4 Departments of Econometrics, University of New England, Armidale.

Battese GE, Coelli T (1988). "Prediction of Firm-Level Technical Efficiencies with A Generalized Frontier Production Functions and Panel Data". J. Econ. 38: 387–99.

Battese GE, Coelli TJ (1995). A Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in a Stochastic Frontier Production Function for Panel Data. Empirical Economics, 20,325- 332.

Battese GE, Corra GS (1977). Estimation of a Production Frontier Model: With Application to the Pastoral Zone of Eastern Australia. Australian J. Agric. Econ. 21, 169-179.

Bravo-Ureta BE, Pinheiro A (1997). Technical, Economic and Allocative Efficiency in Peasant Farming: Evidence from Dominica Republic. The Developing Economics, xxxv-1, 48-67.Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Coelli TJ (1995). Estimators and Hypothesis Tests for Stochastic Frontier Function: A Monte Carlo Analysis. Journal of Productivity Analysis, 6, 247 – 268.

Coelli TJ (1996). "A Guide to FRONTIER Version 4.1c: A Computer Program for Stochastic Frontier Production and Cost Function Estimation," CEPA Working Paper, 96/07, University of New England, Armidale, NSW, 2351, Austria.

Coelli TJ, Rao DSP, Battese GE (1998). An Introduction to Efficiency & Productivity Analysis. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Dordrecht/London, P, 134 - 249.

CSA (2008). Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census, Population Size by Age and Sex.

Ellis F (1988). Peasant Economics: Farm Households and Agrarian Development.

Farrell M (1957). The measurement of productive efficiency. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 120(3): 253-281.

Fikadu G (2004). Analysis of Technical Efficiency of Wheat Production: A Study in Machakel Woreda, Ethiopia.

Forsund F, Lovell CAK, Sc hmidt P (1980). A Survey of Frontier Production Functions and of Their Relationship to Efficiency Measurement: J. Econ. 13, 5-25.

Fulginiti LE, Perrin RK (1998). Agricultural Productivity in Developing countries. Agricultural Economics. 19, 45-51.

Gebrehawaria G (2008).Technical Efficiency of Irrigated and Rain-Fed Smallholder Agriculture in Tigray, Ethiopia: A Comparative Stochastic Frontier Production Function Analysis.

Greene WH (1990). "A Gamma Distributed Stochastic Frontier Model", J. Econ. 46:141-163.

Kinde T (2005).Technical Efficiency of Maize Production: A Case of Smallholder Farmers in Assosa Woreda.

Kodde DA, Palm FC (1986). Wald Criteria for Jointly Testing Equality and Inequality Restrictions. Econometrica. 54(5), 1243-1248.

Kumbhakar SC, Ghosh S, McGuckin JT (1991). "A Generalized Production Frontier Approach for Estimating Determinants of Inefficiency in US Dairy Farms." J. Bus. and Econ, Statistics, Vol.9, 279-280

Meeusen W, van den Broeck J. (1977). Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production Functions with Composed Error. Inter. Econ. Rev. 18,435- 444.

Mohammed E (2010). Determinants of Technical efficiency and farm-level adoption of modern agricultural inputs the case of geba cathmants of northern Ethiopia.

Msuya EE (2008). Reconstructing Agro-Biotechnologies in Tanzania: Smallholder Farmers' Perspective in Reconstructing Biotechnologies (Ed. G. Ruivenkamp, S. Hisano, and J. Jongerden), Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2008.

Obwona M (2006**)**. Determinants of Technical Efficiency Differentials amongst Small- and Medium-Scale Farmers in Uganda: A Case of Tobacco Growers.

Schultz TW (1964). Transforming Traditional Agriculture. Yale University Press. New Haven. CT.

Seyoum EI, Bathese GE, Flemmeng EM (1998).Technical Efficiency and Productivity of Maize Production in Eastern Ethiopia J. Agric. Econ. 1: 341-348.

Tesfay G (2006). "Agriculture, Resource Management and Institutions: a Socioeconomic Analysis of Households in Tigray, Ethiopia." Ph.D Dissertation , Wageningen University, the Netherlands.

Tewodrose A (2001).Farm Household Technical Efficiency: Stochastic Frontier Analysis. A Study of Rice Producers in Mardi Watershed in the Western Development Region of Nepal.

Thiam A, Bravo-Ureta BE, Rivas TE (2001) . Technical Efficiency in Developing Country Agriculture: A Meta-Analysis. J. Agric. Econ. 25,235-430.

Tsegaye Y, Berg E (2005). Technical Efficiency of Maize Production in Southwestern Ethiopia: a case of Jimma zone.

W orld Bank (WB) (2007). African Development Indicators, W orld Bank Report, Washington D.C.

W orld Food Program (WFP) (2009). Summary of Food Security and Vulnerability in Selected Cities of Ethiopia.

Yesuf M, Zaid N (2010). Effect of Microfinance Participation on Farmers' Technical Efficiency: Panel Evidence from Tigray, Northern Ethiopia.

Zenebe G, Oskam A, Tasew W (2005). Technical Efficiency of Peasant Farmers in Northern Ethiopia: A Stochastic Frontier Approach.

Appendix

The Final MLE for Testing Whether Or Not the Inefficiency Effects Jointly Explain Inefficiency

Variable names	Coefficient	standard-error	t-ratio
Input variables			
Constant	4.38	0.282	15.52***
lnld (in tsimad)	0.36	0.141	2.56***
lnlb(in man power)	0.21	0.166	1.26
lnox(oxen days)	1.00	0.209	4.779***
lnfeqpt(Birr)	0.16	0.046	3.45***
Arato	0.83	0.186	4.48***
Siye	-0.12	0.207	-0.596
Tsenkanet	1.12	0.170	6.64***
Inefficiency variables			
Constant	-9.23	2.91	-3.17***
Gender of household heads	0.63	0.771	0.82
Age of household heads	-2.12	0.877	-2.42**
Age square	0.14	0.077	1.81*
Education of household heads	-0.002	0.0008	-2.85***
Family size	-1.37	0.814	-1.69*
Dependency ratio	0.50	0.171	2.94***
number of literate household members	-0.855	0.311	-2.74***
Livestock size	0.29	0.101	2.91***
Access to credit	-0.0001	0.00006	-2.11**
Farm size	-0.56	0.846	-0.66
Farm size square	0.78	0.237	3.30***
Crop diversification	-0.07	0.016	-4.39***
Access to irrigation	-0.50	0.755	-0.66
Share cropping	-1.35	0.662	-2.04**
Off-farm activities	2.44	0.753	3.24***
Land fertility	-2.95	0.780	-3.78***
Members to association	-0.11	0.160	-0.69
σ^2	5.23	1.113	4.70***
g	0.9378	0.018	49.92***
LL	-398.13		
Mean TE	0.6038		