

STOCHASTIC FRONTIER ANALYSIS WITH PRICE RISK: AN APPLICATION TO ORGANIC TEA PRODUCTION IN VIETNAM

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, tea farmers have been used chemicals to protect products. But an over usage of pesticides or preservation compounds has negatively affected on the environment and human health. When the living standard has been improved, consumers have changed into buying cleaner and safer products. Therefore, conventional tea production has been gradually converted into organic ones health requirement standards. However, lacks of researches about profit level as well as potential price risk for organic tea industries might be hard to pursue farmers and policy makers about that movement.

Thai Nguyen province, one of Northern mountainous provinces, has been well-known for its high quality and quantity tea production in Vietnam for along time, which mainly contributes to make tea become one of the country's primary industrial exports. In this field, Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) was applied to estimate profit levels for 180 tea growers selected from four representative communes of two tea producing districts of the Thai Nguyen province. A risk analytical model using the Monte Carlo method was developed to link risk levels to profit for organic tea producers when the premium price for organic tea and market conditions change.

This study shows that organic tea production has a higher profit efficiency level (0.836) than conventional tea production (0.454). If the price premium is removed, the probability that organic tea farmers incur a negative profit is about 22.5% and the probability that the farmers receive profits below the average observed profit increases by 42.5%. Maintaining the price premium is a policy option promoting a smoother transition to organic tea production by stabilizing income.

Key words: Vietnam, organic tea, price premium, profit efficiency, price risk

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently in Vietnam, tea has become one of the country's primary industrial export crops. However, excessive use of pesticides and agro-chemicals in tea production has had negative effects on the environment and to human health. In order to improve the quality of tea products that satisfy health requirement standards, there has been a movement toward converting conventional tea production to organic tea production (Nga, 2007). According to Ngo, Do, Ha & Nguyen (2001, p. 3) "use of pesticides, particularly those of high toxicity has caused a great number of harmful impacts on human health and the environment." Hartman (1996) and the U.S. EPA (1996) also report that consumers generally prefer buying foods produced with less chemicals. Since organic farming prohibits use of synthetic pesticides, consumers perceive organic foods as having low chemical residue (Baker, Benbrook, Groth III, & Lutz Benbrook, 2002; Hartman, 1996).

This research has the following objectives: (i) determine profit efficiency of organic tea production for the Thai Nguyen province of Vietnam, (ii) identify risky and uncertain factors affecting profitability and therefore income security of organic tea producers in Vietnam and

(iii) provide information to assist policymakers in determining whether organic tea production is a viable economic and environmental option for adoption by farmers in Vietnam and to (iv) evaluate the role that the price premium plays for farmers transitioning from conventional to organic tea production.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methods for analyzing profit efficiency

In the frontier-efficiency literature, there have been two primary frontier approaches used to analyze productive efficiency: the econometric approach and the mathematical programming approach (see Lovell and Knox, 1993 for a useful summary). Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977) introduced the stochastic frontier model which incorporates an error term composed of two components: a symmetric component capturing random variations of the frontier across firms and the effects of measurement error and a one-sided component capturing the effects of inefficiency relatively to the stochastic frontier. The econometric approach, often called Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA), is stochastic and the effects from noise can be distinguished from the effects from inefficiency.

There are two different approaches for estimating stochastic profit inefficiency: the primal production frontier approach and the dual variable profit frontier approach. In this research, the dual variable profit frontier approach was used to estimate profit efficiency for organic and non-organic tea production.

In the dual variable profit frontier approach, the profit frontier is assumed as:

$$v\pi = v\pi(pe^{-u}, w, z; \beta) = v\pi(p, w, z; \beta) \cdot h(p, w, z; \beta) \quad (1)$$

where $v\pi = py - w^T x = v\pi\{(pe^{-u})(ye^u) - w^T x\}$, $h(p, w, z; \beta) = v\pi(pe^{-u}, w, z; \beta) / v\pi(p, w, z; \beta)$ is the ratio of profit with technical inefficiency and profit for corresponding points on the profit frontier. Variable descriptions include p as the output price; w is a vector of input prices; y is a scalar of output ($y > 0$); x is a vector of inputs; z is the normalized fixed costs; v is the normalized random effect; u is the normalized profit inefficiency, and β is a vector of estimated technology parameters.

To comply with “regularity conditions”, Thompson and Mark (1989), Goyal and Berg (2004), FAO (2003) and Kolawole (2006) used a normalized profit function, formed by dividing profit, input prices, and other factors by output price.

As an extension of the profit function shown in equation 1, the Cobb-Douglas form of the profit function can be written as:

$$\ln \frac{v\pi}{p} = \beta_0 + \sum_n \beta_n \ln \frac{w_n}{p} + \sum_q \beta_q \ln z_q + v_\pi + u_\pi \quad (2)$$

where v_π represents the random effect and u_π represents the inefficient effect which is a function of age of household head, education level, tea farming experience, distance from home to the closest local market, and tea farm size. Socio-economic variables are often included in the analytical model to determine their possible influence on profit inefficiency (Kolawole, 2006; Liu, 2006; Shuwu, 2006) for tea production. Conformity to Hotelling’s Lemma, negative signs for input cost and input price coefficients would be expected (Coelli, Prasada Rao, & Battese, 1998). It is hypothesized that the cost of inputs negatively affects profit efficiency (Ali and Flinn, 1989; Shuwu, 2006). σ^2_v (σ^2_v) and σ^2_u (σ^2_u) are the variances of the random effect and of the inefficiency effect used to measure variation of

profit from the frontier that can be attributed to profit inefficiency (Battese & Corra, 1977). In this research, σ^2_v and σ^2_u will be used to replace σ^2_v and σ^2_u as suggested by Battese and Coelli (1993).

2.2 Risk analysis

Enger and Smith (2006) reported that most risk assessments are statistical statements of the probability of negative effects. "Risk traditionally has been defined as uncertainty concerning the occurrence of loss and chance of loss is defined as the probability that an event will occur" (Rejda, 2008 p. 4&15).

According to Helton (2005), the underlying idea of sampling based approaches to uncertainty and risk analysis is that the analysis results in $Y(X) = [y_1(X), y_2(X) \dots y_n(X)]$ and are functions of the uncertainty analysis variables $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m]$. In turn, uncertainty in X results in uncertainty in $Y(X)$. In our model, Y is a vector of profit for different tea production methods (e.g., organic and clean tea production) given changes in tea production and market factors of vector X (i.e., tea yield, input expenditures, and tea price) under different tea production methods. A risk analytical model using the Monte Carlo method will be developed to link risk levels to profit for organic tea producers when the premium price for organic tea and market conditions change. The intent is to see how values of the objective function (net returns) change when values of the decision variables vary around their means following fitted distributions of these variables as observed in the sample and to determine whether conversion to organic tea production will be a risky decision in terms of ensuring income security. Using the risk analytical program @RISK 4.5 (Palisade Corporation, 2001), risk levels in terms of probabilities for having a negative profit (net return) are solved for under three different analytical scenarios. The first two scenarios deal with changes in prices alone (i.e., with and without the premium price). The third scenario involves risk in tea production (by allowing all decision variables to vary simultaneously as observed in the sample). These scenarios are evaluated for both organic tea and clean tea production.

3. DATA, EMPIRICAL MODEL, AND ESTIMATION RESULTS

3.1 Study area

The Thai Nguyen province is well-known for its high quality tea and ranks as the second largest province in terms of tea production area (Nga, 2007). This province is also one of the provinces which participated in the International Global Changing Institute (IGCI) project which promotes adoption of organic tea production. These reasons support the selection of the Thai Nguyen province as the research site for this study. Total tea planted area for the Thai Nguyen province accounted for 13.8% of the total tea planted area for the country (Nga, 2007). Representative tea growers selected for the sample include organic tea farms and non-organic tea farms (conventional tea farms and "clean tea"¹ farms) from four representative communes of two tea producing districts of the Thai Nguyen province.

3.2 Sample size determination

Johnson (1980) and Yamane (1967) described the approach used to determine sample size. This approach utilizes the variability of a key variable (crop yield was used for this study) to determine what would be an appropriate sample size that is representative of the population.

$$n = \left[\frac{z(\alpha/2)\sigma}{E} \right]^2 \quad (3)$$

135 where n = sample size,
 136 α = confident level,
 137 z = the two tail z value with the corresponding confident level,
 138 σ = population standard deviation, and
 139 E = precision level (absolute acceptable error).

140 The pretest was performed using 15 tea growers, of which five were organic tea
 141 farms, five were conventional tea farms and the other five were clean tea farms. The
 142 standard deviations of key variables and their precision levels were then plugged in equation
 143 3 using the automatic sample size calculator introduced by Arsham, (2007). The
 144 recommended sample size was 23 organic tea producers, 67 clean tea producers and 59
 145 conventional tea producers. However, to increase the statistical convenience in conducting
 146 survey analysis comparing with and without scenarios, for each organic or clean tea
 147 producer selected in the sample, one conventional tea producer was randomly selected from
 148 the surrounding neighborhood. A total of 180 tea growers were interviewed in the survey
 149 (summing 23, 67 and 90 for organic, clean and conventional tea producers respectively). Of
 150 the 180 tea farmers interviewed, only 176 observations had complete information (outliers
 151 were excluded by using the Hadi [1992] method).

152 3.3 Empirical model

153 The empirical model for profit efficiency can be written as:

$$154 \ln(\text{profit}/p) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(\text{plabor}/p) + \beta_2 \ln(\text{pfer}/p) + \beta_3 \ln(\text{pecost}/p) + \beta_4 \ln(\text{hcost}/p) + \beta_5 \ln(\text{ocost}/p) \\ 155 + \delta_1 \text{Intexp} + \delta_2 \text{Inage} + \delta_3 \text{Intare} + \delta_4 \text{distm} + \delta_5 \text{edu} \quad (4)$$

156 where profit is net returns (th.VND²/ha/year), p is the price of fresh tea (th.VND/kg),
 157 plabor is the price of labor³ (th.VND/ man day), pfer is the price of fertilizer (th.VND/ kg of
 158 nitrogen equivalent), pecost is the expenditure for pest and disease control⁴
 159 (th.VND/ha/year), hcost is the expenditure for health care and hospitalization
 160 (th.VND/ha/year) as an indirect measurement of environmental cost, ocost is other variable
 161 costs (fuel, irrigation fee etc.) in th.VND per ha per year, texp is tea growing experience
 162 (years), age is the age of the household head (years), tare is the tea farm size (m²), distm is
 163 the distance from home to the closest local market (= 1 if < 1km, = 2 if from 1-2 km, = 3 if >3
 164 km), and edu is the education level of the household heads (= 1 if elementary education, = 2
 165 if middle school education, = 3 if high school graduate and = 4 if higher).

166 All variables in the model were corrected for normality problems (skewedness and
 167 kurtosis) by using the trans-log form as suggested by Sheskin (2004) (Table 1a and 1b).
 168 The heteroskedasticity problem was checked by using the Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg
 169 test. A correction for heteroskedasticity was done by standardizing variables (dividing each
 170 variable by its standard deviation) as suggested by Varian (1992) and Kuosmanen et al.
 171 (2007) before estimating the actual profit efficiency model.

172 **Table 1a. . Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Tea Farming Households**

173 **Table 1b . Descriptive Statistics of Variables for Profit Efficiency Analysis (2006)**

174 3.4 Estimation results

175 Profit efficiency is of interest to policy makers in developing government intervention
 176 programs. The dual method applied in this research to analyze tea profit efficiency provides
 177 information about factors influencing profit efficiency and the estimated magnitudes of these
 178 effects. Results from the profit efficiency estimation for organic tea production are presented
 179 in Table 2.

Table 2. Results from Profit Efficiency Estimation

These estimation results are based on the stochastic frontier profit efficiency analysis and on the assumption that tea production can be approximated by a Cobb-Douglas production function. The organic tea results for the variance analysis (Insigma^2_v for the random effect and Insigma^2_u for the profit inefficient effect) show that the inefficiency effect for profit efficiency is negative and statistically significant. This result implies the significant presence of profit inefficiency in the profit model for organic tea production. The negative and significant effect of pest and disease control costs for organic tea production conforms to hypothesized theory and observations made earlier by Ali and Flinn (1989), Kolawole (2006), Abdulai and Huffman (2000). This reflects the fact that for organic tea production, pest control costs contribute significantly to reduced profit efficiency due to the application of a more costly pest control method to substitute for synthetic pesticides. The positive and significant effect of tea growing experience for organic tea production implies that more experience in tea growing will increase profit efficiency. These results are consistent with Ali and Flinn (1989), Abdulai and Huffman (2000) and Shuwu (2006). Note that labor and fertilizer prices do not have statistically significant effects on profit efficiency for organic tea production. This reflects the fact that most organic tea farms use family labor and apply domestic animal manures to substitute for chemical fertilizers. Therefore, changes in the price of hired labor and chemical fertilizer price do not significantly impact profit efficiency.

As defined by Vinatea (2005), clean tea production is a tea farming practice that minimizes usage of pesticides and other chemical inputs and adopts Integrated Pest Management (IPM) for pest and disease control in tea production. The products from clean tea production are free of pesticides and chemical residues but are not certified as organic. This can be thought of as an intermediate tea production method between the conventional and organic tea production methods.

Unlike the organic tea profit efficiency results shown previously, fertilizer price has a negative and statistically significant effect on profit efficiency for clean tea production which is consistent with previous studies (Ali and Flinn (1989), Abdulai and Huffman (2000), Kolawole (2006) and Shuwu (2006)).

The negative effect of distance (from home to the local market) on profit efficiency suggests that being farther away from the market, tea farmers will incur larger transportation costs resulting in lower profit efficiency. The positive and significant effects of the farm size variable is similar to results reported by Ali and Byerlee (1991), Abdulai and Huffman (1988) and Kolawole (2006). The tea growing experience variable has the same effect on profit efficiency for clean tea production as it does for the organic tea production.

Clean tea variance analysis for the random error (Insigma^2_v) is statistically insignificant whereas the inefficiency element (Insigma^2_u) is significant (at the 1% level). These results imply a significant presence of the inefficiency element but an insignificant presence of the random effect on profit efficiency for clean tea production in the sample.

Results from profit efficiency estimation for conventional tea production indicate that the coefficient of Insigma^2_v (random error) is not statistically significant suggesting an insignificant effect from random factors in conventional tea production for the sample. However, the variance of the inefficiency effect (Insigma^2_u) is statistically significant at the 1% level indicating a significant presence of inefficiency on profit efficiency for conventional tea production in the sample.

Among input price variables, fertilizer and pesticide prices have statistically significant effects on profit efficiency for conventional tea production. However, the negative signs for the coefficients of fertilizer price and pest control costs (expected signs as discussed in the methodology section) suggest that as the price of fertilizer and pest control costs increase, profit efficiency will decrease. These results are consistent with previous work done by Ali and Flinn (1989), Abdulai and Huffman (2000), Kolawole (2006) and Shuwu (2006). The negative and large (in absolute value terms) coefficient on fertilizer price for conventional tea production illustrates a strong dependency on chemical inputs. To halt use of chemical inputs and pesticides will likely cause a large reduction in tea yield and, hence, conventional tea production profit.

The results shown in Table 3 illustrate the mean comparison of profit efficiency for the three different tea production methods (i.e., organic, clean and conventional tea production) using the Stochastic Profit Frontier Analysis (SFA). The results show that the highest profit efficiency (0.836) is obtained from organic tea production whereas conventional tea production has the lowest mean profit efficiency (0.454). Also, clean tea producers have a significantly higher mean profit efficiency level as compared to conventional tea producers.

Table 3. Cross Comparison of the Means for Profit Efficiency

Profit efficiency analyses for the three different tea production methods in the Thai Nguyen province indicate that organic tea farmers have the highest efficiency level (an average of 0.836). Also, the results show a significantly lower profit efficiency level for conventional tea producers (an average of 0.454).

3.5 Risk and profits for organic tea production

The basic profit equation used in the profit efficiency analysis for tea production

$$\pi = py - w^T x$$

The profit equation for organic tea production per hectare can be re-written as:

$$v\pi = py - \text{labcost} - \text{fercost} - \text{pecost} - \text{hercost} - \text{hcost} - \text{ocost} \quad (5)$$

where $v\pi$ is profit for tea production (th.VND/ha/year), p is fresh organic tea price (th.VND/kg), y is fresh tea yield (kg/ha/year), labcost is labor expenditures⁵ (th.VND/ha/year), fercost is fertilizer expenditures (th.VND/ha/year), pecost is expenditures for pest and disease control⁶ (th.VND/ha/year), hercost is herbicide expenditure (th.VND/ha), hcost is expenditures for health care and hospitalization (th.VND/ha/year) as an indirect measurement of environmental cost, and ocost is other costs in th.VND/ha/year (fuel, irrigation fee etc.).

This profit equation was used as the objective function for the risk analysis involving organic tea production. The cumulative distribution functions (CDF) depicted in Figure 1 are the results of simulations conducted for 500 trials using a Monte Carlo risk analytical model discussed in the earlier methodology section. The risk involved in organic tea production was examined in scenario (1) by allowing a change in tea price when other production factors are fixed at their means (see graphs a and b in Figure 1) and in the scenario (2) when allowing changes in all decision variables following their fitted distributions as observed for organic tea production in the sample (see graph c Figure 1). The cumulative probability distribution functions in this figure show how a change in the tea price and changes in all production factors (Figure 1) for organic tea production would affect profitability of organic tea growers. As Haldar and Mahadvan (2000) and Rejda (2008) defined risk objectives in terms of output uncertainty characterized by a probability distribution function and as uncertainty concerning the occurrence of loss and chance of loss. Mahadevan and Smith (2003) also report that “a probabilistic optimization will

characterize uncertainty objectives and constraints in terms of probability distribution and statistics" (Mahadevan and Smith, p. 8, 2003). Thus, in this research, the risk involved in organic tea production is depicted by the change in the probability that organic tea farmers will receive negative profits or the increased probability that organic tea farmers will receive profits that fall below the average observed profit in the sample.

Figure 1. Profit for Organic Tea with and without the Premium Price

In the first simulation (scenario 1), only organic tea price is allowed to vary (all other variables are kept constant). The graphs a and b in Figure 1 plot the simulations for tea price changes (i.e., with and without the premium price). This figure shows that given currently observed socio-economic conditions for organic tea farms in the Thai Nguyen province, if the premium price is removed, the cumulative probability density function for profit shifts to the left in parallel fashion and the probability of profit being less than average (i.e., average profit from tea production in the sample of VND 11, 314,000) increases from 2.4% to 64.2% (61.8% increase). By removing the premium price⁷ for organic tea products, the probability that organic tea farmers will have negative profits is about 30%. This result shows how sensitive profitability of organic tea production is to the premium price for organic tea products.

In the second analysis, all variables including organic tea price are allowed to change as observed in the sample (i.e., all decision variables follow their fitted distributions in the sample for organic tea production). Graph a in Figure 1 plots the simulation which shows the probability that profit for current organic tea production being less than the average is 21.7% (recall average profit from tea production in the sample was VND 11,314,000). Also, the probability that organic tea farmers will have negative profits is about 7.5% (Figure 1). The net effects of the premium price are obtained by subtracting the increases in the probability of tea farmers having negative profits or having profits fall below the observed average profit caused by the change in tea price only by the probability of tea farmers having negative profits or profits falling below the observed average profits caused by the fluctuation of all production factors for the organic tea production. These results infer that the net increases in the probability that organic tea farmers will have negative profit and have profit less than the average are 22.5% (i.e., 30% - 7.5%) and 42.5% (i.e., 64.2% - 21.7%) respectively.

3.6 Risk and profit for clean tea production

Similar to the organic tea production results, Equation 5 was also used as the objective in the risk analytical model for clean tea production. Figure 2 shows that given currently observed socio-economic conditions for clean tea farms, if there is no premium⁸ for the clean tea product, then, the probability of having profit less than zero is approximately 28.7% (increasing by 28.7% from 0% to 28.7% in Figure 2 a). The effect of removing the premium price on the probability of facing losses is less severe for clean tea production as compared to the organic tea production. The probability of profits falling below average profit (i.e., VND 11, 314,000) increases by 33.6% (from 22% to 55.6%, see Figure 2). Also, the graphs in Figure 2 show that at current socio-economic conditions, the probability that profit for clean tea farmers is less than the average is 36.7% and the probability that clean tea farmers will experience negative profits is 13.3% (graph c in Figure 2). These translate into net increases in the probability that clean tea farmers will have negative profit and have profit less than the average are 15.4% (i.e., 28.7% - 13.3% = 15.4%) and 18.9% (i.e., 55.6% - 36.7% = 18.9%) respectively. This effect is also less severe in comparison to the effect of removing the premium price on organic tea production (i.e., the net increase in the probability of profit being less than the sample average increased by 42.5% for organic tea). These results suggest that removing the premium price will have higher risk effects for organic tea producers than for clean tea producers.

Figure 2. Profit for Clean Tea with and without the Premium Price

4. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Profit efficiency

Organic tea farmers in the Thai Nguyen province of Vietnam were relatively more profit efficient as compared to clean tea and conventional tea producers. Significant factors affecting profit efficiency for organic tea farms include pest control costs and tea growing experience. Pest control costs (non-chemical alternatives for organic tea production) had a significant and negative effect on profit efficiency indicating that current pest control methods are not effective and have a dampening effect on profit efficiency. This is a major concern in organic tea production. Also, tea growing experience had a significant and positive effect on profit efficiency for organic tea production suggesting more experienced farmers have higher profit efficiency.

Fertilizer price and health care related costs were statistically significant and negatively related to profit efficiency for clean tea production while other input costs (labor, pesticide, and other costs) did not have significant effects on profit efficiency for clean tea production. Among inefficient factors, only family size had a significant and positive effect while the age of the household head had a negative and significant effect on profit efficiency for clean tea production only. The highest mean profit efficiency was obtained from organic tea production while conventional tea production had the lowest mean profit efficiency. Also, mean profit efficiency for clean tea production was statistically higher than for conventional tea production.

4.2 Risks and profit

Given current and observed socio-economic conditions for organic tea farms in the Thai Nguyen province, if the premium price is removed for the organic tea product, the probability of profit being less than observed average profit (i.e., VND11,314,000) increases by 61.8% and the probability that organic tea farmers incur a negative profit or economic loss is about 30%. Whereas, current risk involved in organic tea production in Thai Nguyen represented by the probability that organic tea farmers incur an economic loss is about 7.5% implying the net effect of removing the premium price alone is an increase in the probability of incurring a negative profit to tea farmers of 22.5% (i.e., 30% - 7.5%).

Given current and observed socio-economic conditions for clean tea farms, if there is no premium price for the clean tea product, then, the probability of having negative profits or losses is about 15.4% (i.e., 28.7% - 13.3%). However, the probability of profit falling below the observed average profit (i.e., VND 11,314,000) increases by only 18.9% (from 36.7% to 55.6% see Figure 2). The effect of removing the premium price on profit reduction is less severe for clean tea production than for organic tea production because clean tea receives a lower premium price than organic tea production (currently the premium prices are about 10% and 30% higher than the regular market price for clean tea and organic tea products respectively).

4.3 Policy implications

The findings discussed in the previous sections suggest that the creation of a market mechanism that guarantees a premium price for the organic tea product would be a policy intervention by the government assisting the development of organic tea production. By removing the premium price, organic tea farmers in the Thai Nguyen province will be at risk

373 of earning negative profits (22.5%) and having a high probability (42.5%) of receiving profits
374 that are lower than the observed average profit received by all tea farmers.

375 Note that there are market niches for organic tea products in the domestic market.
376 Raising awareness of health and environmental benefits from organic tea production or
377 requiring product labeling with product quality control certification would competitively create
378 a higher price for organic tea products domestically in the long run without the use of
379 governmental administrative intervention.

380 The finding of the negative and significant effect from pest and disease control
381 costs for organic tea production implies that these costs contribute significantly to reduced
382 profit while substituting for synthetic pesticides. Pimentel et al. (2005) reported that "in
383 organic production systems, pest control can be of heightened importance and impact
384 dealing with pest insects and plant pathogens that adversely affect yields is a major problem
385 in organic crop production" (Pimentel et al. 2005 p 580). Applying crop management
386 measures that can enhance healthy crops and help reduce pests in organic tea farms, such
387 as intercropping with leguminous crops (Do & Le, 2000), would be promoted. Selection of
388 tea varieties that are resistant to pests and diseases is also advised to promote expansion of
389 organic tea production in Vietnam.

390 The positive and significant effects of the tea growing experience on profitability for
391 organic tea production, on the other hand, imply that more experience in tea growing will
392 reduce tea profit inefficiency. This result is similar to the result reported by Ali and Byerlee
393 (1991) and Sharma et al., (1999) that experienced tea farmers are better performers than
394 those without experiences. The government can also hire successful organic tea farmers to
395 demonstrate their production practices as a means of promoting organic tea production in
396 Vietnam.

397

398 REFERENCES

- 399 Abdulai A., Huffman WE. Structural Adjustment and Efficiency of Rice Farmers in Northern
400 Ghana. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 2000;48(3):503-521.
- 401 Aigner D, Lovell CAK, Schmidt P. Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier
402 Production Function Models. *Journal of Econometrics*. 1977;6:21-37.
- 403 Ali M, Flinn JC. Profit Efficiency among Basmati Rice Producers in Pakistan Punjab.
404 *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 1989;71(2):303-310.
- 405 Ali M, Byerlee D. Economic Efficiency of Small Farmers in a Changing World: A Survey of
406 Recent Evidence. *Journal of International Development*. 1991;3(1):1-27.
- 407 Arsham H. Sample Size Determination. 2007. Accessed 16 January 2008.
- 408 Available: <http://www.ubalt.edu/ntsbarsh/index.html>.
- 409 Baker BP, Benbrook CM, Groth III E, Lutz BK. Pesticide residues in conventional, integrated
410 pest management (IPM)-grown and organic foods: insights from three US data sets. *Food*
411 *Additives & Contaminants*. 2002;19(5): 427-446.
- 412 Battese GE, Corra GS. Estimation of a Production Frontier Model: With Application to the
413 Pastoral Zone of Eastern Australia. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*.
414 1977;21:169-179.
- 415 Battese GE, Coelli TJ. A Stochastic Frontier Production Function Incorporating a Model for
416 Technical Inefficiency Effects. Working Papers in Econometrics and Applied Statistics
417 Department of Econometrics. University of New England. 1993;69: 22.

418 Coelli T, Prasada RDS, Battese GE. An introduction to efficiency and productivity analysis.
419 Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1998.

420 Do NQ, Le TK. Giáo trình cây chè: Sản xuất, Chế biến và Tiêu thụ. Nhà xuất bản Nông
421 nghiệp; 2000. Vietnamese.

422 Enger EE, Smith BF. Environmental Sciences: A Study of Interrelationships. 10th ed. New
423 York: McGraw-Hill/Glencoe; 2006.

424 FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). Project on Livestock Industrialization, Trade and
425 Social-Health-Environment Impacts in Developing Countries. 2003. Accessed 15 January
426 2007.

427 Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/009/j0307e.htm>.

428 Goyal SK, Berg E. An Analysis of Marketed Surplus Response of Cereals in Haryana State
429 of India. *Agribusiness*. 2004;20(3):253-268.

430 Hadi AS. Identifying Multiple Outliers in Multivariate Data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
431 *Society. Series B (Methodological)*. 1992;54(3):761-771.

432 Haldar A, Mahadevan S. Probability, Reliability and Statistical Methods in Engineering
433 Design. 1st ed. New York: Wiley; 2000.

434 Hartman H. Food and the Environment: A consumer's perspective Phase 1. In The Hartman
435 report. Seattle, WA. USA: Hartman Group. 1996;60.

436 Helton JC. Sampling-Based Methods for Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis. Temple, AZ
437 85287-1804. Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Arizona State University. Arizona.
438 USA; 2005.

439 Johnson DH. The Comparison of Usage and Availability Measurements for Evaluating
440 Resource Preference. *Ecology*. 1980;61(2):65-71.

441 Kolawole O. Determinants of Profit Efficiency among Small Scale Rice Farmers in Nigeria: A
442 Profit Function Approach. Paper presented at the International Association of Agricultural
443 Economists Conference, Gold Coast, Australia, August 12-18, 2006. International
444 Association of Agricultural Economists. 2006.

445 Kuosmanen T, Post T, Scholtes S. Non-parametric Tests of Productive Efficiency with
446 Errors-in-Variables. *Journal of Econometrics*. 2007;136: 131-162.

447 Liu Y. Model Selection and Implication in Stochastic Frontier Analysis: Maize Production in
448 Kenya. East Lansing, MI 48824: Department of Agricultural Economics and Department of
449 Economics, Michigan State University. 2006.

450 Harold OF, Lovell CAK, Schmidt S, editors. Production Frontiers and Productive Efficiency.
451 Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK: The Measurement of Productive Efficiency:
452 Techniques and Applications; 1993.

453 Mahadevan S, Smith N. System Risk Assessment and Allocation in Conceptual Design.
454 Hampton, Virginia: National Aeronautics and Space Administration. 2003; No. NASA/CR-
455 2003-212162.

456 Meeusen W, Broeck JVD. Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production Function
457 with Composed Error. *International Economic Review*. 1977;18(2): 435-444.

458 Nga NT. Báo cáo thực trạng phát triển vùng chè Thái Nguyên. Department of Agriculture
459 and Rural Development of Thai Nguyen Province. 2007. Vietnamese.

460 Ngo KO, Do PT, Ha MT, Nguyen TD. Vietnam Country Report. Paper presented at the 7th
461 Global Information Network on Chemicals (GINC), Tokyo, Japan. 2001.

462 Palisade Corporation. Guide to RISKOptimizer: Simulation Optimization for Microsoft Excel.
 463 New Field, NY USA 14867. 2001.

464 Pimentel D, Hepperly P, Hanson B, Douds D, Seidel R. Environmental, Energetic, and
 465 Economic Comparisons of Organic and Conventional Farming Systems. BioScience. 2005;
 466 55(7):573-583.

467 Rejda EG. Principle of Risk Management and Insurance. 10th ed. Boston, MA 02116, USA:
 468 Pearson Education, Inc; 2008.

469 Sharma KR, Leung P, Zaleski HM. Productive Efficiency of the Swine Industry in Hawaii:
 470 Stochastic Frontier vs. Data Envelopment Analysis. Journal of Productivity Analysis. 1997;
 471 8(4): 447-459.

472 Sheskin D. Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Statistical Procedures. 3rd ed. Boca
 473 Raton, Fla. Chapman & Hall/CRC. London. UK; 2004.

474 Shuwu HT. Profit Efficiency Among Rice Producers in Eastern and Northern Uganda.
 475 Makerere University. Kampala. Africa; 2006.

476 Thompson GD, Mark L. Profit Function Approximations and Duality Applications to
 477 Agriculture. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1989;71(3):791-798.

478 US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). Food Quality Protection Act Implementation
 479 Plan. 1996. Accessed 27 April 2009.

480 Available: <http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/regulating/laws/fqpa/backgrnd.htm>

481 Varian HR. Microeconomic Analysis. 3rd ed. Norton. New York. USA; 1992.

482 Vinatea (Vietnam National Tea Cooperation). Tea News. 2005. Accessed 21 December
 483 2007.

484 Available: <http://www.vietnamtea.net>.

485 Yamane T, editor. Statistics: An Introductory Analysis . 2nd ed. Harper and Row. New York.
 486 USA;1967.

487

Table 1a. . Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Tea Farming Households

Statistics	Production method	Variables ¹				
		Age	Tea area	Education	Tea exp.	Distm.
Mean	Organic	43.2	1,545	2.3	19.1	1.6
	Clean	44.6	3,763	2.1	21.0	1.9
	Conventional	46.1	2,569	2.2	22.1	2.0
Standard Deviation	Organic	9.2	762	0.8	7.1	0.8
	Clean	10.6	2,105	0.5	8.2	0.7
	Conventional	9.3	2,505	0.6	10.1	0.8
Max	Organic	64.0	4,000	4.0	30.0	3.0
	Clean	75.0	10,100	3.0	43.0	3.0
	Conventional	65.0	20,000	3.0	50.0	3.0
Min	Organic	26.0	750	1.0	8.0	1.0
	Clean	27.0	720	1.0	5.0	1.0
	Conventional	21.0	450	1.0	5.0	1.0

Table 1b . Descriptive Statistics of Variables for Profit Efficiency Analysis (2006)

Statistics	Production method	Variables ² (Normalized variables)						
		profit	plabor	pfer	pecost	hcost	hercost	ocost
Mean	Organic	4510	2.25	1.19	111	83	0	799
	Clean	4632	2.69	1.43	415	174	222	736
	Conventional	3459	3.46	1.84	646	331	213	1163
Standard Deviation	Organic	1687	0.41	0.22	92	112	0	483
	Clean	1631	0.47	0.25	271	286	344	380
	Conventional	1742	0.98	0.53	501	1013	353	771
Max	Organic	7201	2.9	1.5	283	526	0	1769
	Clean	7400	3.6	1.9	1282	1808	1485	1941
	Conventional	6295	6	3.2	2333	8930	1489	4744
Min	Organic	214	1.5	0.8	0	0	0	0
	Clean	142	1.9	1	56	0	0	0
	Conventional	0	2.1	1.1	0	0	0	0

¹ Distm is a distance from home to a closest local market = 1 if < 1 km, = 2 if from 1-2 km, = 3 if > 3 km; Age: age of the household head (years); Education level of the household head: = 1 if elementary, = 2 if middle, = 3 if High school graduate and = 4 if higher; Tea exp is tea farming experience in years; tea area (m²)

² Profit denotes normalized profit, plabor is normalized price of labor, pfer is normalized price of fertilizer, pecost is normalized pest control costs, hcost is normalized health care costs, hercost is normalized herbicide costs and ocost is normalized other variable costs (fuel, irrigation etc.,)

498 **Table 2. Results from Profit Efficiency Estimation**

Variable	Organic tea	Clean tea	Conventional tea
Constant	7.5110	11.910***	8.298***
Labor price	-0.497	0.099	2.684
Fertilizer price	0.403	-0.397***	-4.194**
Pest control cost	- 0.023*	-0.048	-0.053***
Health care cost	-0.005	-0.006***	0.007
Other costs	-0.007	-0.009	-0.006
Tea farm size	-0.164	0.164**	0.516
Distance to market	-0.049	-0.121***	0.031
Farming experience	0.796**	0.064 ***	-0.456
Age of HH head	-0.392	-0.019	0.338
Education	0.320	0.085	0.047
Lnsigma ² _v	-32.797	-34.885	-28.23
Lnsigma ² _u	-0.667**	-0.735***	3.90***
Wald chi ² (11)	2e+7***	3e+08***	4+06***
R ² for profit	0.53	0.36	0.35
Observation	23	67	86

499 *** = Statistically significant at the 1% level, ** = statistically significant at the 5% level,

500 * = statistically significant at the 10% level;

501 Source: computed from field data survey.

502

503

504 **Table 3. Cross Comparison of the Means for Profit Efficiency**

Pair-comparison	Statistics		
	Mean	Standard deviation	Prob. t > t*
Organic tea vs.	0.836	0.092	0.011**
Clean tea	0.747	0.232	
Organic tea vs.	0.836	0.092	0.000***
Conventional tea	0.454	0.285	
Clean tea vs.	0.747	0.232	0.000***
Conventional tea	0.454	0.285	

505

506 H₀: No difference in means, *** = significant at the 1% level. ** = significant at the 5% level

507 Source: data computed from field survey data in 2007.

508




Figure 1: Profit for Organic Tea with and without the Premium Price
(All factors fixed except price)

- a: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for organic tea production given the conditions that all variables but tea price are fixed at their means and allowing tea price to vary as the observed price for organic tea (with premium price) in the sample.
- b: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for organic tea production given the conditions that all variables but tea price are fixed at their means as observed for organic tea producers and tea price varies as the observed tea price for conventional tea (without premium price) in the sample.
- c: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for organic tea production given the conditions that all variables vary as observed in the sample.




Figure 2: Profit for Clean Tea with and without the Premium Price
(All factors fixed except price)

a: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for clean tea production given the conditions that all variables but tea price are fixed at their means and allowing tea price to vary as the observed price for clean tea (with premium price) in the sample.

b: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for clean tea production given the conditions that all variables but tea price are fixed at their means as observed of clean tea producers and tea price varies as the observed tea price for conventional tea (without premium price) in the sample.

c: The cumulative probability distribution function of the profit for clean tea production given the conditions that all variables vary as observed of clean tea producers in the sample.

¹ Clean tea production is a tea farming practice that minimize use of pesticides and other chemical inputs and adopts Integrated Pest Management (IPM) for pest and disease control in tea production. The products from the clean tea production method may be free of pesticide and chemical residues but are not classified as organic tea.

² th.VND: thousand Vietnam Dong, a monetary unit of Vietnam (\$1USD = 16,600 VND in June, 2008).

³ Labor in this research was treated as an aggregate variable consisting of family labor and hired labor for tea production per hectare (Yotopoulos and Lau, 1971; Sharma et al., 1997).

⁴ For organic tea production, pesticide use is not allowed. Given this requirement, total expenditure for pest and disease control is used to replace pesticide and herbicide prices.

⁵ Labor in this research was treated as aggregate labor consisting of family labor and hired labor for tea production per hectare (Yotopoulos and Lau, 1973; Sharma et al., 1997).

⁶ Since pesticides are not allowed in organic tea production, for convenience in calculations and analyses, total expenditures for pest and disease control were used to replace pesticide price.

⁷ The premium price is the tea price received by tea farmers for their organic tea product (th. VND/kg of a fresh tea) and without premium price is the tea price offered for conventional tea product observed in the sample collected in the Thai Nguyen province.

⁸ The premium price is the tea price received by tea farmers for their clean tea product (th. VND/kg of a fresh tea) and without premium price is the tea price offered for conventional tea product observed in the sample collected in the Thai Nguyen province.