

Bayes Approach to the Estimation of Technical Efficiency and Returns to Scale in Agriculture: A case of Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Most studies in Nigeria have focused on the classical approach to estimating technical efficiency. In this paper, we examine technical efficiency of small farms by estimating a stochastic production frontier model using the Bayesian methodology. The model is applied to farm household data from Nigeria. The results obtained show that farm size, fertilizer, hired and family labour are positive and significant at 5%. The estimated stochastic frontier function indicates that farms are technically inefficient. Efficiency was found to be positively influenced by the age, gender, education, extension visits and participation in off-farm activities. We also found that the farms in our sample exhibited increasing Returns to Scale. Our findings have significant policy implications as it draws attention to increasing agricultural productivity through improving the existing level of efficiency of small farmers.

Keywords: Agriculture, Bayesian stochastic frontier, Technical Efficiency, Nigeria

1. INTRODUCTION

The contribution of the agricultural sector to Nigeria's economy cannot be downplayed. Its role in employing the bulk of the nation's population and contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) remains significant (1). Despite its important role however, there have been very little expenditure on agriculture by government in Nigeria. (2) reported that between 2001 and 2005, less than 2 percent of total federal expenditure was channeled to agriculture.

Also of immediate concern is the huge food-import bill. According to a (3) there is expected to be a rise from \$4.0 billion in 2011 to an estimated \$5 billion by end of 2012 on total food and agricultural imports in Nigeria. Given this enormous expenditure, it is argued that substituting domestic food production with importation, government would not only save money but create jobs and give existing farmers a sustainable livelihood.

In Nigeria, agriculture is dominated by smallholder farmers (4) however these farmers have been categorized as the poorest of the poor (5)(6). Several authors drawing from the works of (7) have argued that farms in developing countries are poor but efficient. (7) argued that these poor farmers' productivity remains constrained due to limited available resources and necessary agricultural technologies. However, most agricultural policies in Nigeria have discriminated against smallholder farmers (8). Successive policy makers dwelt on the

assumption that large farms are more technically efficient than small scale farms without basing their conclusion on empirical findings.

Given the nature of the identified problems, this paper thus examines the level of technical efficiency of small farms in Nigeria. Specifically, the study identifies the significant determinants of technical inefficiency and estimates the elasticity of output and returns to scale.

1.1 Literature Review

Several terms have been used to describe 'technical efficiency' although all of these are consistent with the proposition of (9) in which technical efficiency is referred to as obtaining maximum output with a set of inputs by applying a given level of technology. In estimating technical efficiency, numerous methodologies have been proposed and different criteria have been advanced as the reason for adopting any given methodology. (10) and (11) have reported using a specific methodology based on its simplicity; while (12) and (13) have been driven by the type of data available. In a similar light, (14) reported that for most empirical studies, priority is accorded based on individual preference and the objectives of the research. However other empirical studies have proven that no single methodology clearly defeats the other or is adequately appropriate for all studies.

There are two main approaches to the stochastic frontier model: the Classical and Bayesian approach. While the basis of estimation is similar for both, there have been extensions and combinations of techniques. Notable among this is the half-normal and exponential developed by (15), the truncated normal developed by (16); and (17) two-parameter gamma distribution.

Technical efficiency in agriculture has been shown to vary between and within countries particularly in developing countries. (18) in a cross-county review of studies on frontier in developing countries that dealt with analysis of farm level efficiency examined 30 studies from 14 different countries. They found that the average technical efficiency index from the studies reviewed ranged from 17 to 100 percent. This led the authors to conclude that output from agriculture in developing countries can be increased given the existing technology. More specifically, the summary of the results of a meta-analysis of technical efficiency in Nigeria agriculture by (19) which covered a total of 64 studies results showed an increase in mean technical efficiency in Nigerian agriculture increased significantly over the years. Characteristics peculiar to the different studies such as sample size, number of variables included in the model in addition to crop or livestock specific studies were reported to have significant impact on mean technical efficiency. Interestingly, compared to the other regions, studies carried out in the North-central, South-west, and South-south regions of the country reported higher mean technical efficiency.

Some author have examined the technical efficiency of crop (and) or livestock farmers in Nigeria and have come up with notable results. By adopting the cost route approach, (20) used stochastic frontier approach to analyze the determinants of technical efficiency in garden egg production in Uyo metropolis, Nigeria. In this study, with exception of capital, all production variables analyzed in the model were statistically significant which implied an increasing production function. They identified the main determinants of efficiency as farm size and gender; and smaller farms were found to be more efficient than larger ones as reported by (11) in a separate study. Along gender lines, women were reported more technically efficient than men and this was attributed to the smaller farm size owned by women. Overall the mean technical efficiency was 86%. This mean efficiency is similar to the findings of (21), (22) but notably higher than (5) whose result of rural and urban farmers of 66% and 57% show that rural farmers were more efficient than urban farmers.

(23) examined the technical and scale efficiencies in rice production by farmers in Ebonyi State Nigeria. They analyzed data using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) approach. From the results obtained, they reported about 70% of the rice farmers as operating with increasing returns to scale. In addition, their results showed only about 5% of the farmers were 100% technically efficient in resource utilization under variable returns to scale. Using the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) technique on primary farm data, (24) examined the determinants of food crop production and technical efficiency in the guinea savannas of Borno State, Nigeria. Their results identified farm size, fertilizer and hired labour as the main factors that affect changes in the output of food crops. Factors which were reported to affect efficiency were age, education, credit, extension and crop diversification. Judging from their findings; given the current state of technology, technical efficiency in food crop production could be increased through better use of available resources.

Recent studies (25), (26), (27), (28) have used the Bayesian approach in examining productivity and efficiency in agriculture. While the advantages of the Bayesian method is pointed out by Bayesian econometricians, (29) and (30) however reports little difference between Bayesian and classical procedures when the results were obtained from methods that depend on comparable assumptions. This study goes beyond most studies carried out particularly in Nigeria as it takes a step further to examine technical efficiency in Nigeria agriculture by employing a different estimation approach.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Model Specification

We estimated the production technology of the farms by analysing the log-likelihood estimate of the Cobb-Douglas-type stochastic frontier model. The model is specified as:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \beta_j X_{ji} + \sum_{m=1}^M \delta_m Z_{mi} + (z_i - u_i) \quad (3.1)$$

Where

Y = natural logarithm of the total value of output (in Naira)

X_1 = farm size (hectares)

X_2 = quantity of fertilizer used (kilogram)

X_3 = amount spent on other input (Naira)

X_4 = hired labour used (man-days)

X_5 = family labour used (man-days)

β is a vector of parameters that describes the frontier

And the inefficiency component in equation (3.1) is made up of:

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \delta_0 + \delta_m Z_m$$

U_{ji} = Technical inefficiency of the i th farm

Z_1 = Age of farmer

Z_2 = Gender

Z_3 = Education

Z_4 = Marital status

Z_5 = Access to extension and information network

Z_6 = Ownership of Savings

Z_7 = Access to Credit

Z_8 = Land ownership

Z_9 = Off-farm activities

141 δ 's are unknown parameters to be estimated along with the variance parameters.

142

143 In order to analyse the data, the Bayesian software 'MATLAB' was used. To ensure that we
144 present the production inputs in a standard unit (per hectare), data was normalised before
145 being subjected to Bayesian stochastic frontier estimation. Results were generated from
146 10,000 'burn-in' Gibbs samples using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo method before
147 collecting same size samples.

148 The key justification for adopting the Bayesian approach (similar to reasons advanced by
149 (27), (28)) is that Bayesian estimation allows for execution of models that were previously
150 categorised as 'difficult to handle models', and it provides precise small-sample empirical
151 conclusions on efficiencies in addition to the possibility of including prior information in its
152 estimation.

153

154 2.2 Data

155

156 The data is obtained from the Nigeria National Bureau of Statistics 2010-2011 panel survey
157 which is a component of the revised General Household Survey (GHS-Panel). The survey
158 consists of panel data on households, their characteristics, welfare and their agricultural
159 activities and household consumption. To obtain the sample used for this study, purposive
160 sampling was employed. Out of a total farm household, data from 1306 respondents who
161 engaged in crop production were used for the study.

162

163 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

164

165 3.1 Bayesian Stochastic Frontier

166

167 Estimates of technical efficiency for Nigeria agriculture are presented in Table 3.1. The
168 results show that the elasticities of farm size, fertilizer, cost of other production inputs, hired
169 and family labour are significantly positive. This corroborates the results of (31). The positive
170 coefficient of farm size, fertilizer, cost of other production inputs, hired and family labour land
171 implies that an increase in any of these variables will have a positive impact on production
172 output.

173

174 Mean percent efficiency scores is estimated as 84%. The coefficient of sigma and omega
175 parameters is statistically different from zero indicating that the distributional form assumed
176 for the composite error term is correct thus implying that the appropriateness of the frontier
177 method chosen.

178

179 **Table 3.1: Bayesian Stochastic Frontier Estimation for Nigeria Agriculture**

Stochastic frontier		Coefficient	t-value
Farm size	β_1	1.54***	11.71
Fertilizer	β_2	0.74 ***	10.13
Input cost-others	β_3	0.04*	1.86
Hired labour	β_4	0.60***	4.91
Family labour	β_5	1.24***	33.10
Inefficiency function			
Age	Z_1	-1.00**	-2.08
Gender	Z_2	-2.35**	-1.97
Education	Z_3	-0.75*	-1.82
Marital Status	Z_4	-6.29***	-2.81
Freq. of Ext. visit	Z_5	-0.05	-0.05
Savings	Z_6	-2.95	-1.51

Credit	Z ₇	4.04***	2.79
Land ownership	Z ₈	1.25	0.48
Off-farm activities	Z ₉	-7.87***	-3.25
R-Square	R ²	0.74	
Sigma statistics		1.61***	3.31
Omega statistics		3.94***	2.82

*Significant at 10%, **Significant at 5%, ***Significant at 1%

Source: Computed from 2010/2011 Nigerian General Household Survey dataset

3.2 Inefficiency Indices

The distribution of the inefficiency indices as presented in Table 3.2 shows that mean age of farmers is 49 years. This implies that farmers were in the economically active age range. The level of education ranged between no-education and adult education with primary education being predominant. This low level of literacy has its consequences on farm decision making. Majority of respondents are married and depends on personal saving. The implication of this is that such savings may not be large enough to meet farm expenditure and hence discourage expansion. Also we find that majority of farmers' farm on communal or borrowed land. This situation usually encourages tenure insecurity and determines to a large extent the type of crop that is cultivated.

Table 3.2: Distribution of the Inefficiency Indices

Variables	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Age	49	14.26	21	104
Education	21.8	16.42	0	61
Credit	0.30	0.46	0	1
Marital status	0.93	0.24	0	1
Freq. of Ext. visit	0.6	2.15	0	22
Savings	0.20	0.40	0	1
Land ownership	0.91	0.27	0	1
Off-farm activities	0.54	0.49	0	1

Source: Computed from 2010/2011 Nigerian General Household Survey dataset

The coefficient of age, gender, education, marital status and participation in off-farm activities are significant and negative while credit is significant and positive. Each significant inefficiency variable is discussed further.

Age: The negative estimated coefficient for age of farmer implies that efficiency is increased by age. Although this result corroborates (22) and (32) it however contradicts (33). We argue here that up to a certain age, the older the farmer the more experienced he/she becomes and so does his efficiency level increase.

Gender: Male headed farm households are found to be more technically efficient. Similar results have been reported by (34) (35) and (36). In line with earlier literature we buttress the fact that smallholder farming in Nigeria is typically crude and involves significant exertion of energy thus male farmers are in better position to meet this farm energy demand.

Education: The negative sign of the estimated coefficient of education is consistent with literature ((37), (38), (34)) and indicates that the level of education affects decision-making ability and adoption of practices that increases technical efficiency.

Credit: Contrary to prior-expectations and findings from literature (including (35)) access to credit is significantly positive. This implies that greater access to credit decreases technical efficiency. We argue here that because majority of farm household are poor, diversion of credit to household consumption is widespread. More so, as poor small holder farmers improve their living standard, the less the incentive for them to farm as agriculture (especially in rural areas) in Nigeria is seen as a residual industry for the poor.

218 **Off-farm participation:** Similar to (39) & (40) off-farm activity clearly influences technical
219 efficiency positively implying that farm household that engage in off-farm activities are likely
220 to obtain higher technical efficiency. This relationship is attributed to augmenting farm
221 income with extra income from off-farm activities thus enabling farmers afford additional
222 inputs and improve their ability to cope with risk in agriculture.

223

224 **3.3 Elasticity of Output and Returns to Scale**

225 Table 3.2 is a presentation of output elasticity and returns to scale obtained from the
226 coefficient of first order terms.

227

228 **Table 3.2:** Statistics of parameters of the Stochastic Frontier Model

Variables	Output Elasticity
Farm size	1.54
Fertilizer	0.74
Other inputs	0.04
Hired labour	0.60
Family labour	1.24
Returns to Scale	4.16

229 **Source:** Computed from 2010/2011 Nigerian General Household Survey dataset

230

231 The estimated output elasticity of all production inputs was positive and therefore consistent
232 with economic theory. The highest elasticity (1.54) was recorded for farm size thus a 1%
233 increase in farm size will increase production by 1.54% while the lowest (0.04) was for cost
234 of other inputs. The Return to Scale (RTS) of 4.16 strongly suggest increasing returns which
235 implies that each addition of input will lead to more than proportionate change in the output.
236 This portrays farmers as being in stage 1 of production function thus implying that if all factor
237 inputs are increased by 1%, farm output would increase by 4.16%. (41) reported slightly
238 higher RTS in his study while (42) finding was lower than that obtained in this study. Thus
239 the finding from this study corroborates that from earlier studies in Nigeria.

240

241 **4. CONCLUSION**

242 This paper contributes to the literature on Bayesian estimation of farm level efficiency by
243 addressing the issue of technical efficiency and returns to scale in Nigeria agriculture. From
244 the estimated results, we find that age, gender, level of education, extension visits and
245 participation in off-farm activities had a positive effect on technical efficiency.

246 The paper further reports that there exists the possibility of improving technical efficiency in
247 Nigeria farm by as much as 16% with the present resource endowment; without necessarily
248 changing the existing level of technology. Factor identified to positively influence technical
249 efficiency were age, gender, education, marital status and participation in off-farm activities.

250 We find that majority of farms not at the efficient stage of production as they are operating in
251 the first stage (stage 1) of the production function which reflects increasing returns to scale.
252 Thus if all factor inputs are increased by 1%, farm output would increase by 4.16%. In other
253 words a more-than-proportionate increase in output will be obtained from a proportionate
254 increase in input. In line with our findings, support should be provided in form of farm
255 production inputs rather than credit while farmers should be trained on entrepreneurial skills
256 as returns from off-farm activities have been found to complement farm income and improve
257 technical efficiency. Our findings have significant policy implications as it draws attention to
258 increasing agricultural productivity through improving the existing level of efficiency of small
259 farmers.

260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310

REFERENCES

1. Kanayo O, Nancy S, Maurice, OU. A Review of Value Added in Nigeria's Pre and Post-SAP Agricultural Sector: Background and Issues. *Journal of Economics & Behavioral Studies*. 2013; 5(1). Mogue T, Morris M, Freinkman L, Adubi A, Ehui S. Agricultural public spending in Nigeria. *Intl Food Policy Res Inst*. 2008.
2. Global Agricultural report Exporter Guide 2012 accessed on 23rd November 2013. Available from: http://gain.fas.usda.gov/Recent%20GAIN%20Publications/Exporter%20Guide_Lagos_Nigeria_11-20-2012.pdf.
3. Afolabi JA. Analysis of loan repayment among small scale farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. *J. Soc. Sci.*. 2010; 22(2): 115-119.
4. Ajibefun IA. Analysis of policy issues in technical efficiency of small scale farmers using the stochastic frontier production function: With application to Nigerian Farmers. In *International Farm Management Association Congress*, Wageningen, Netherlands 2002.
5. Asogwa BC, Umeh JC, Ihemeje, JC. Analysis of poverty status determinants among smallholder farmers in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 2012; 4(1): 8-15.
6. Schultz, T. *Transforming Traditional Agriculture* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.
7. Enwerem, VA, Ohajianya, DO. Farm Size and Technical Efficiency of Rice Farmers in Imo State, Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences* ISSN: 2276-7770. 2013; 3 (2):128-136.
8. Farrell, MJ The measurement of productive efficiency. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*. 1957; 120(3): 253-290.
9. Piesse J, Thirtle, C, Turk J. Efficiency and ownership in Slovene dairying: a comparison of econometric and programming techniques. *Journal of Comparative Economics*. 1996: 22(1), 1-22.
10. Mathijs E, Swinnen, JF. Production organization and efficiency during transition: An empirical analysis of East German agriculture. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 2001; 83(1): 100-107.
11. Meeusen W, van Den Broeck, J. Efficiency estimation from Cobb-Douglas production functions with composed error. *International economic review*, 1977. 18(2): 435-444.
12. Coelli T, Perelman S. (Technical efficiency of European railways: a distance function approach. *Applied Economics*. 2000; 32(15), 1967-1976.
13. Wadud A, White B. Farm Household Efficiency in Bangladesh: A Comparison of Stochastic Frontier and DEA Models. *Applied Economics*. 2000: 32 (13); 1665-73.
14. Aigner D, Lovell CAL, Schmidt P. Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models. *Journal of econometrics*. 1977; 6(1): 21-37.
15. Stevenson R. Likelihood function for generalized stochastic frontier estimation, *Journal of Econometrics*. 1980; 13: 51-66.
16. Greene WH. A gamma -distributed stochastic frontier model. *Journal of econometrics*, 1990; 46(1): 141-163.
17. Bravo-Ureta BE, Pinheiro AE. Efficiency analysis of developing country agriculture: a review of the frontier function literature. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. 1993; 22(1): 88-101.
18. Ogundari K. A meta-analysis of technical efficiency in Nigerian agriculture. In 2009 Conference, August 16-22, 2009, Beijing, China (No. 50327). *International Association of Agricultural Economists* 2009.

- 311 19. Okon UE, Enete AA, Bassey, NE. Technical efficiency and its determinants in
312 garden egg (*Solanum* spp) production in Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State. *Field*
313 *Actions Science Reports*. The journal of field actions, (Special Issue 1) 2010.
- 314 20. Shehu JF, Iyortyer JT, Mshelia SI, Jongur, AAU. Determinants of Yam Production
315 and Technical Efficiency among Yam Farmers in Benue State, Nigeria. *J of Soc Sci.*
316 2010; 24(2): 143-148.
- 317 21. Idiong IC. Estimation of farm level technical efficiency in smallscale swamp rice
318 production in cross river state of Nigeria: a stochastic frontier approach. *World*
319 *Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2007; 3(5): 653-658.
- 320 22. O'raye DO, Chukwuji O, Okeke C. Efficiency of Resource Use by Rice Farmers in
321 Ebonyi State, South East Nigeria: A Data Envelopment Analysis. *Asian Journal of*
322 *Agriculture and rural Development*, 2012: 2(2), 149-154.
- 323 23. Amaza PS, Bila Y, Iheanacho AC. Identification of Factors that Influence Technical
324 Efficiency of Food Crop Production in West Africa: Empirical Evidence from Borno
325 State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics*. 2006;
326 107(2):139-147
- 327 24. Fernandez C, Osiewalski J, Steel MF. On the use of panel data in stochastic frontier
328 models with improper priors. *Journal of Econometrics*. 1997; 79(1): 169-193.
- 329 25. Annaert J, Van Den BROECK J, Vander Vennet R. Determinants of mutual fund
330 underperformance: A Bayesian stochastic frontier approach. *European Journal of*
331 *Operational Research*, 2003:151(3); 617-632.
- 332 26. Tomberlin D, Holloway G. Trip-Level Analysis of Efficiency Changes in Oregon's
333 Deepwater Trawl Fishery 2007.
- 334 27. Areal FJ, Tiffin R, Balcombe K. Farm technical efficiency under a tradable milk quota
335 system. *Journal of dairy science*. 2012; 95(1): 50-62.
- 336 28. Kim Y, Schmidt P. A review and empirical comparison of Bayesian and classical
337 approaches to inference on efficiency levels in stochastic frontier models with panel
338 data. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*. 2000; 14(2): 91-118.
- 339 29. Murillo-Zamorano, LR. Economic efficiency and frontier techniques. *Journal of*
340 *Economic surveys*. 2004; 18(1): 33-77.
- 341 30. Ogundari K. Crop diversification and technical efficiency in food crop production: A
342 study of peasant farmers in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 2013;
343 40(3): 267-287.
- 344 31. Kolawole O. Determinants of profit efficiency among small scale rice farmers in
345 Nigeria: a profit function approach. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences*. 2006;
346 1(1): 116-122.
- 347 32. Ojo SO. Productivity and technical efficiency of poultry egg production in Nigeria.
348 *International journal of poultry science*, 2003: 2(6); 459-464.
- 349 33. Ekunwe PA, Emokaro CO. Technical efficiency of catfish farmers in Kaduna,
350 Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 2009; 5(7): 802-805.
- 351 34. Ashagidigbi, W. M., Sulaiman, S. A., & Adesiyun, A. (2011). Technical and Allocative
352 Efficiency of Poultry Egg Producers in Nigeria. *Agricultural Journal*, 6(4), 124-130.
- 353 35. Solis D, Bravo-Ureta BE, Quiroga RE. Technical efficiency among peasant farmers
354 participating in natural resource management programmes in Central America.
355 *Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2009; 60(1): 202-219.
- 356 36. Coelli T, Rahman S, Thirtle C. Technical, Allocative, Cost and Scale Efficiencies in
357 Bangladesh Rice Cultivation: A Non-parametric Approach. *Journal of Agricultural*
358 *Economics*. 2002; 53(3): 607-626.
- 359 37. Shehu JF, Mshelia SI, Tashikalma AK. Analysis of technical efficiency of small-scale
360 rain-fed upland rice farmers in North-west agricultural zone of Adamawa State,
361 Nigeria. *J. Agri. Soc. Sci.*, 2007; 3(4).

- 362 38. Rahman SA, Umar HS. Measurement of technical efficiency and its determinants in
363 crop production in Lafia local government area of Nasarawa state, Nigeria. *Agro-*
364 *Science*. 2009 8(2); 90-96.
- 365 39. Asefa S. Analysis of technical efficiency of crop producing smallholder farmers in
366 Tigray, Ethiopia 2011.
- 367 40. Adeyemo R, Oke JTO, Akinola AA. Economic Efficiency of Small Scale Farmers in
368 Ogun State, Nigeria. *Tropicultura*, 2010; 28(2): 84-88.
- 369 41. Nwaru JC, Iheke OR. Comparative analysis of resource use efficiency in rice
370 production system in Abia state of Nigeria. *Journal of American Science*, 2010;
371 6(11): 396-408