

# **Cost-Price Squeeze in Export Oriented Crop Production: Welfare Implication for Commercialized Smallholder Tea Producers in Kenya**

## **Abstract**

Tea production, a leading export crop in Kenya produced largely by smallholders was analysed to determine how the input and output prices adjust to both inflation and exchange rates. We hypothesized that prices received and prices paid by farmers were not cointegrated and that a cost-price squeeze could not be rejected in the long-run. Based on the cointegration analysis results, we could not reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration between prices paid and prices received in the long run. Macroeconomic variables impacts unevenly on the tea sector with negative effects on the welfare of smallholders. The livelihood of export oriented cash crop producers in less developed countries becomes more vulnerable to market forces. Price volatility coupled with constant market shocks could impact negatively on the food access of the farmers.

**Key words:** *Cost-Price Squeeze, Export Oriented Crop, Commercialized, Smallholder Tea Producers, Kenya*

## **Introduction**

It has been hypothesised that farmers face a dual market structure, a competitive output market structure and oligopolistic input market structure (Moss, 1992; Tweeten, 1980). Under the two market conditions, farmers are price takers who buy inputs and sell outputs through integrated international trade. Fluctuations in output prices and costs of inputs such as labour, energy and fertilizers are often beyond the control of smallholder farmers. This holds true particularly for smallholder commercialized subsistent farmers in developing countries who produce their outputs mainly for export market using imported inputs. Market Integration of traditional agriculture into the regional, national, and international exchange economies is generally aimed at spurring growth in the sector with positive welfare effects accruing to the rural population dependent on the sector. The net gains are however not always priori assured (von Braun, et al., 1991). Integrating these farmers into regional and international markets may increase their vulnerability to volatile market prices.

Cost-price squeeze phenomenon has been hypothesised in agriculture (Moss, 1992). It is thought that input prices tend to respond more readily to inflation than output prices. The major concern is that if inflation is much more apparent in prices paid by farmers than prices received by farmers then it will result in a declining ratio of prices received to prices paid (cost-price squeeze) (Campiche, et al., 2006a). According to the cost-price squeeze theory, when inflation is present, prices paid by farmers increase more than prices received by farmers (Tweeten & Griffin, 1976). The cyclical nature of agricultural markets plays a large role in the farm cost-price squeeze (Shilds, 2009). Few studies have investigated the existence of cost price squeeze in agriculture and the source of it (Campiche, et al., 2006a; Campiche, et al., 2006b; Moss, 1992; Tweeten, 1980). The studies have used time series cointegration

approach to test the evidence of cost-price squeeze in agriculture. If prices received and prices paid are cointegrated then the hypothesis of cost-price squeeze in the long-run is rejected (Engle & Granger., 1987). However, these studies have arrived at varied conclusions.

The cost-price squeeze is tested by examining if prices paid and prices received by farmers are cointegrated. If prices paid and prices received are cointegrated, then a fixed long-run equilibrium exists between the two and hence absence of cost-price squeeze. Tweeten (1980) found that general inflation impacts unevenly on the supply and demand curves for farm output hence changing the ratio of prices received to prices paid by farmers. Moss (1992) examined the evidence of a cost-price squeeze in U.S. agriculture and found that prices paid by farmers and prices received by farmers were not cointegrated. However, when (Campiche, et al., 2006a) repeated the same analysis, they found no evidence of cointegration. Campiche et al (2006b) did analysis for specific commodities and their results were confirmed. No further attempts in literature have been done to affirm either finding elsewhere other than US data.

The current study investigates the evidence of cost price-squeeze in Kenya's smallholder tea sector and considers the role of inflation and exchange rates on input and output prices in the subsector. Purchasing power parity (PPP) theory presupposes cointegration between the nominal exchange rate and foreign and domestic prices (Schweigert, 2002). However, exchange rates may impact unevenly on the demand and supply of goods and services depending on the size and balance of trade of a country. Since Kenya is a net importer of goods and services, it is more likely that there will be uneven impact of global trade on the domestic market. The paper begins with a brief review of post liberalization changes in the experience of smallholder tea sector in Kenya, and the factors behind fluctuations in the international trade. This provides the foundation for a conceptual framework for considering the key issues affecting the smallholder farming in Africa when they shift from food production for cash crop production. Building on this framework we use time series data to investigate the evidence of cost price squeeze in tea subsector in Kenya.

### **Smallholder tea Sub-sector in Kenya**

Kenya is one of the two leading black-tea exporting countries globally. Kenya's small-holder tea sub-sector has been dubbed Africa's success story. Tea is the largest export earner with the value of tea exports comprising about 3 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) (FAO, 2012). Kenya has about 560, 000 small-holders, comprising 62 percent of the total tea production in the country (FAO, 2012). When smallholder farmers were introduced into cash crop production, the Kenyan government put in place strategies to guarantee sufficient household food supply. One strategy required farmers to set aside a minimum size of land for food production. Another strategy was that farmers were required to produce tea at a minimum given size of land to ensure economies of scale. However, the advent of market liberalization saw these strategies abandoned and subsequently, despite favourable prices of tea in the international market, food security and poverty levels have ensued among these farm households.

Real primary producer prices of tea production have fallen dramatically over the last three decades, threatening its sustainability (van der Wal, 2008). Globally, tea trade is dominated by few international companies profiting from stable retail prices. Production costs are estimated to account for 8% of the retail price of tea in the foreign market, including labour, input, and transport costs (van der Wal, 2008). Tea production is labour intensive and labour cost constitutes the largest share of production cost in the sector. In Kenya, tea industry has experienced increasing cost of labour wages due to pressure from trade unions and increasing cost of living. Efforts to adopt cost cutting technologies are not feasible in Kenya, where the industry largely is dominated by smallholder farmers with low capacity to acquire new cost cutting technologies. Coupled with this, fertilizer and energy costs have been rising over time. Prices of imported fertilizer are affected by global prices and exchange rate fluctuations.

## Methodology

### *Data*

Five year monthly data from April 2009 to March 2014 was used. The NPK (triple superphosphate) monthly price was used to represent input prices paid by farmers since it is one of the major variables in tea production. The data was obtained from compilation of Index Mundi from World Bank measured in US Dollars per Metric Ton. Mombasa, Kenya average monthly auction prices in US cents per Kilogram was used as output prices. These are the prices of Best Pekoe Fannings traded at Mombasa Auction. Output prices were obtained from the compilation of index Mundi originally sourced from IMF. Monthly exchanges data were obtained from Central Bank of Kenya (CBK). Consumption price indices, obtained from the Kenya national Bureau of Standards (KNBS), were used to measure inflation.

### *Empirical Analysis*

Cointegration test is used to determine if the model gives empirically meaningful relationships. If variables have different trend processes, it implies that they cannot stay in fixed long-run relation to each other, and we cannot model the long-run and therefore nothing can be inferred validly based on standard distributions (Sjö, 2008). There are several tests for cointegration. The two commonly used methods include Johansen and the Engle Granger approach. Engle Granger approach is commonly used to test single equations (Campiche, et al., 2006a). But the Johansen test is the most fundamental and most superior test (Sjö, 2008). Johansen approach allows for more than one cointegrating relationships to be estimated (Campiche, et al., 2006a). Johansen approach is widely applied than the Engle–Granger test which is based on Dickey–Fuller (or the augmented) test for unit roots in the residuals from a single (estimated) cointegrating relationship (Johansen, 1991).

Following Campiche et al (2006a), a multivariate autoregressive Johansen model [1] in a vector error correction (VECM) form is used to estimate multiple cointegration relationships.

$$\Delta \mathbf{X}_t = \Gamma_1 \Delta \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \dots + \Gamma_{k-1} \Delta \mathbf{X}_{t-k+1} + \Pi \mathbf{X}_{t-K} + \mathbf{u}_t, \quad [1]$$

Where  $\mathbf{X}_t$  is a vector of  $n$  possible endogenous variables and  $\mathbf{X}_t$  are the unrestricted vector autoregression (VAR) models including  $k$ -lags of  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . The parameters  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_i$  measures the short-run adjustment to  $\Delta\mathbf{X}_t$ , whereas  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  contains information on the long-run adjustment to  $\Delta\mathbf{X}_t$ . Testing for cointegration entails testing the rank of coefficient  $\mathbf{\Pi}$ , such that if  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  has full rank, then the variables are stationary. If the rank of  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  is zero, it implies cointegration relationships do not exist. If  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  has reduced rank,  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  can be divided into  $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\alpha}\mathbf{\beta}'$ , where  $\mathbf{\alpha}$  represents the speed of adjustment and  $\mathbf{\beta}$  is a matrix of long-run coefficients. The cointegration hypothesis provides the inference for the existence of cost price squeeze. Cointegration is used to estimate a multivariate model to determine if prices received and prices paid by farmers are cointegrated with each other or with the general price level or the exchange rate.

Usually, the first step in Johansen cointegration is to test for unit root. This property is investigated prior to the construction of an econometric model. Unit root test is a descriptive tool performed to classify series as either stationary or non-stationary at level (Sjö, 2008). Cointegration is a necessary criterion for stationarity among non-stationary variables (Sjö, 2008). If the variables are integrated it will lead to non-standard distributions and possibly spurious regression results. If a data series appear to be stationary, which is the maintained hypothesis then we reject the null hypothesis of a unit root. The Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test (ADF) was utilized in this study to test for unit root. After establishing the unit root for each variable, cointegration rank ( $r$ ) was then estimated to determine if cointegration relationships exist between the variables. The properties of a range of maximum eigenvalue and trace tests for the cointegrating rank of a vector autoregressive process were compared to arrive at the rank of the cointegration. If the rank is non-zero, it implies that there is cointegration among variables and that there is long run association among the variables (i.e. variables move together in the long run). When the variables are cointegrated it implies that we can model both the long run and short run relationships using the VECM Model. If the variables are not cointegrated (integrated of rank order  $I(0)$ ), then we can only model short run relationships using unrestricted (VAR). Either the VECM or VAR models can be used to make inferences about the causal relationships among variables.

## Results and Discussions

**Table 1**  
**Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for Unit Root**

---

Number of obs = 59

| Sample: April 2009-March 2014                                                                                                                 |                                   |        |        |        |                                   |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                               | Unit Root in Non-Differenced Data |        |        |        | Unit Root with 1 Differenced data |        |        |        |
|                                                                                                                                               | Tea Price                         | NPK    | CPI    | EXR    | DTea                              | DNPK   | DCPI   | DEXR   |
| Test Statistic                                                                                                                                | -2.093                            | -0.962 | -2.240 | -1.783 | -3.775                            | -3.100 | -3.095 | -3.679 |
| <i>Critical values for rejection of hypothesis of unit root at 5% Critical Value=-3.491 for Non-Differenced and -2.927 with 1 Differenced</i> |                                   |        |        |        |                                   |        |        |        |

Source: Authors Computation 2014

Results in Table 1, present the ADF tests of the four variables. From the table we accept the null hypothesis of unit root with non-differenced data. We reject the null hypothesis of unit root with 1 differenced in the data of all the variables. This implies that all variables are integrated of order one and can be tested for cointegration. According to lag selection criteria in Table 7, two lags were used in a vector error correction model was used to test Johansen cointegrating rank.

Table 2 shows the Johansen cointegration rank test.

We do not reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration among the variables. The maximum eigenvalue statistic in Table 3 confirms our results in table 2. This implies that there is no long run association among the four variables and that prices received and paid by farmers do not move together in the long run. These results are consistent with the results of Moss

**Table 2**  
**Johansen tests for cointegration**  
**Trace statistic test**

| Trend:       | constant |            |            | Number of obs   | =                 | 58 |
|--------------|----------|------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|----|
| Sample:      | April 09 | - Mar-14   |            | Lags            | =                 | 2  |
| maximum rank | Parms    | LL         | eigenvalue | trace statistic | 5% critical value |    |
| 0            | 20       | 805.64599  | .          | 34.0657*        | 47.21             |    |
| 1            | 27       | -797.06889 | 0.25604    | 16.9115         | 29.68             |    |
| 2            | 32       | -791.82381 | 0.16545    | 6.4213          | 15.41             |    |
| 3            | 35       | -789.12068 | 0.08900    | 1.0151          | 3.76              |    |
| 4            | 36       | -788.61315 | 0.01735    |                 |                   |    |

Source: Authors Computation 2014

(1992) but inconsistent with those of Campicheet *al* (2006a and b). According to Moss (1992), when the prices received and prices paid do not move together it implies that cost price squeeze will exist in the long run. Our results show that even after excluding other macroeconomic variables in Table 4 and 5, the prices paid and prices received are not cointegrated.

Since there are no long run association among variables we model short run association using unrestricted VAR model to test the causal relationships. From Table 6, it is clear that changes in tea output prices do not adjust to the changes in general price level (CPI) and exchange rate (EXR), but the changes in CPI adjusts to the changes in tea output prices.

196

**Table 6: Granger causality Wald tests**

| Equation  | Excluded   | chi2             | df       | Prob> chi2   |
|-----------|------------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| Tea_Price | NPK        | 0.29096          | 2        | 0.865        |
|           | CPI        | 0.18723          | 2        | 0.911        |
|           | EXR        | 0.40661          | 2        | 0.816        |
|           | <b>ALL</b> | <b>1.4653</b>    | <b>6</b> | <b>0.962</b> |
| NPK       | Tea_Price  | 5.9616           | 2        | 0.051        |
|           | CPI        | 4.2854           | 2        | 0.117        |
|           | EXR        | 8.8293**         | 2        | 0.012        |
|           | <b>ALL</b> | <b>23.447***</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>0.001</b> |
| CPI       | Tea_Price  | 6.2424**         | 2        | 0.044        |
|           | NPK        | 5.8505           | 2        | 0.054        |
|           | EXR        | 1.1901           | 2        | 0.552        |
|           | <b>ALL</b> | <b>19.549***</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>0.003</b> |
| EXR       | Tea_Price  | 4.8243           | 2        | 0.090        |
|           | NPK        | 11.786***        | 2        | 0.003        |
|           | CPI        | 3.1704           | 2        | 0.205        |
|           | <b>ALL</b> | <b>12.736**</b>  | <b>6</b> | <b>0.047</b> |

*Source: Authors Computation 2014*

197

198 Changes in input prices (NPK), however, adjusts to changes in both the CPI and EXR. When  
 199 the CPI increases or the EXR decreases, the real income for smallholder tea farmers will  
 200 decrease since the tea output prices do not respond to these changes. Similarly, cost of input  
 201 readily adjusts to the changes in EXR which may impact negatively on the cost of production.  
 202 The Kenyan shilling has been losing value since 2010 following the financial crisis. If NPK  
 203 prices adjust to the decrease in the value of the shilling then the cost of production will  
 204 increase. Consequently, the changes in both tea output price and input prices will be impacted  
 205 unevenly hence cost-price squeeze in the sector cannot be overruled. The results show  
 206 apparent uneven impact of macroeconomic variables in the export oriented sector. Therefore  
 207 the negative impacts on the revenue and general welfare of the farmer in this sector is evident.

208

## 209 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

210 The presence of cost-price squeeze in export oriented crop was investigated. Tea production,  
 211 a leading export crop in Kenya and produced largely by smallholders was analysed to  
 212 determine how the input and output prices adjust to both inflation and exchange rate. We  
 213 hypothesized that prices received and prices paid by farmers were not cointegrated and that a  
 214 cost-price squeeze could not be rejected in the long-run. Based on the cointegration analysis  
 215 results, we could not reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration between prices paid and  
 216 prices received in the long run. Macroeconomic variables impacts unevenly on the tea sector  
 217 with negative effects on the welfare of smallholders. The livelihood of export oriented cash  
 218 crop producers in less developed countries becomes more vulnerable to market forces with  
 219 commercialization. Price volatility coupled with constant market shocks could impact  
 220 negatively on the food access of the farmers.

221

222 The long run viability of the smallholder tea sub-sector in Kenya depend largely on adoption  
 223 of efficient technologies, market integration and expansion of its consumer base in the market.

A shift from high cost conventional production technologies to modern production methods will help cut down the cost of production. The sub-sector should integrate vertically by supplying to the retail market directly, especially in Europe. The government, through Export Promotion Council, should support farmers to package and sell their teas directly in the foreign market. To increase the profit margins, farmers should widen its consumer base by investing in value addition products thus capturing the diverse tastes and premium prices and new market segments. Examples of current consumer driven tastes and preferences include organic and bio-dynamic value addition to made tea.

Further research should be done using more input data and with datasets covering longer periods. Labour inputs and energy prices constitute significant cost of inputs in tea production and data from these variables can give a much clear picture of cost-price squeeze in the sector.

## References

- Arieff, A., 2010. *Global Economic Crisis: Impact on Sub-Saharan Africa and Global Policy Responses*, Darby: DIANE Publishing..
- Campiche, J. L., Bryant, H. L., Richardson, J. W. & Outlaw, J., 2006a. An Analysis of Cointegration: Investigation of the Cost-Price Squeeze in Agriculture. *Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings*, 5-8 February.
- Campiche, J. L., Bryant, H. L., Richardson, J. W. & Outlaw, J. L., 2006b. Investigation of the Cost-Price Squeeze for Individual Agricultural Commodities. *Western Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings*, 30 June.
- CBK (Central Bank of Kenya), n.d.
- Chapoto, A., 2013. *Food Security in the Pocket or Food First? Synergies and tradeoffs of cash cropping on Food Security*. Yamoussoukro, Cote d'Ivoire, s.n.
- Compton, J., Wiggins, S. & Keats, S., 2010. *Impact of the global food crisis on the poor: what is the evidence*. London, ODI, 99.. 99 ed. London: ODI.
- Engle, R. a. D. G., 1987. Co-Integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation, and Testing. *Econometrica*, 55(2), pp. 251-76.
- Engle, R. F. & Granger., D. W., 1987. Co-Integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing. *Econometrica*, 55(2), pp. 251-76.
- FAO REU, 2010. *The Impact of the Economic and Financial Crisis on Agriculture and Food Security in Europe and Central Asia: a Compendium.*, Budapest: FAO.
- FAO, 2012. Contribution of Smallholders to the Tea Sub-Sector and Policies Required to Enhance their Livelihood. *Committee on Commodity Problems, Intergovernmental Group On Tea, Twentieth Session, Colombo, Sri Lanka*, 30 January.
- Hazell, P. & Poulton, C., 2007. All-Africa Review of Experiences with Commercial Agriculture: Case Study on Food Staples. *Competitive Commercial Agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa (CCAA) Study*, May.
- Index Mundi, n.d.
- Johansen, S., 1991. Estimating and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models. *Econometrica*, 59(6), pp. 1551-1580.
- Jr., P. J. B., 2010. Penson J. B., Jr. (2010) Discussion: Revisiting Macroeconomic Linkages to Agriculture: The Impact of Macroeconomic Variables and the Oil Sector on Farm Prices and Income. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 42(3), pp. 487-490.
- Kadlecikova, M., Kapsdorferova, Z. & Filo, M., 2012. The Impacts of the Global Financial Crisis on Agriculture in Central and Eastern Europe and in Central Asia. *Acta Oeconomica et Informatica*, 15(2), pp. 43-46.

- 286 KNBS (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, n.d.
- 287 Lin, J. Y. & Martin, W., 2010. The financial crisis and its impacts on global agriculture. *Agricultural*
- 288 *Economics*, 41(1), pp. 133-144.
- 289 Moss, C. B., 1992. The cost-price squeeze in agriculture: an application of cointegration. *Review of*
- 290 *Agricultural Economics*, 14(2), pp. 205-213..
- 291 Penson, J. B., 2010. Discussion: Revisiting Macroeconomic Linkages to Agriculture: The Impact of
- 292 Macroeconomic Variables and the Oil Sector on Farm Prices and Income. *Journal of Agricultural and*
- 293 *Applied Economics*, 42(3), pp. 487-490.
- 294 Pick, H. D. & McCalla, A. F., 1985. *Do Macroeconomic Variables Affect Agricultural Trade Sector? An*
- 295 *Elasticities Analysis*, Minneapolis: International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium .
- 296 Schuh, E. G., 1974. The Exchange Rate and U.S. Agriculture. *American Journal of Agricultural*
- 297 *Economics*, 56(1), pp. 1-13.
- 298 Schweigert, T. E., 2002. Nominal and Real Exchange Rates and Purchasing Power Parity During the
- 299 Guatemalan Float. *Journal of Economic Development* , 27(2), pp. 127-142.
- 300 Shields, D. A., 2009. *The Farm Price-Cost Squeeze and U.S. Farm Policy*, Washington D.C.:
- 301 Congressional Research Service.
- 302 Sjö, ,. B., 2008. *Testing for unit roots and cointegration*. Lindköpings: Nationalekonomiska
- 303 institutionen, Lindköpings Universitet..
- 304 Tweeten, 1980. Macroeconomics in Crisis: Agriculture in an Underachieving Economy. *Western*
- 305 *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 5(2), pp. 89-106.
- 306 Tweeten, L. G. & Griffin, S., 1976. *General Inflation and the Farming Economy*, Oklahoma: Stillwater,
- 307 Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station.
- 308 Tyler, G., 2006. All-Africa Review of Experiences with Commercial Agriculture: An African Success
- 309 Story-the Development of a Competitive Tea Export Industry. *Competitive Commercial Agriculture in*
- 310 *Sub-Saharan Africa (CCAA) Study*.
- 311 van der Wal, S., 2008. *Sustainability Issues in the Tea Sector: A Comparative Analysis of Six Leading*
- 312 *Producing Countries* , Amsterdam : Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations .
- 313 von Braun, H., den Haen, J. & Blanken, J., 1991. *Commercialization of Agriculture under Population*
- 314 *Pressure: Effects of Production, and Nutrition in Rwanda*, IFPRI Research Report., Washington DC:
- 315 IFPRI.
- 316 Wanzala, M. N. et al., 2001. *Agricultural Production Incentives: Fertilizer Markets and Insights from*
- 317 *Kenya (No. 55150)*, Michigan: Michigan State University, Department of Agricultural, Food, and
- 318 Resource Economics.

**Table 4**

**Johansen tests for cointegration without macroeconomic variables**

**Trace statistic test**

| Trend:              | constant     |            |                   | Number of obs          | =               | 58              |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Sample:             | April 09     | - Mar 14   |                   | Lags                   | =               | 2               |
| <b>maximum rank</b> | <b>parms</b> | <b>LL</b>  | <b>eigenvalue</b> | <b>trace statistic</b> | <b>5% value</b> | <b>critical</b> |
| 0                   | 6            | -514.51178 | .                 | 5.4156*                | 15.41           |                 |
| 1                   | 9            | -512.67589 | 0.06134           | 1.7438                 | 3.76            |                 |
| 2                   | 10           | -511.80399 | 0.02962           |                        |                 |                 |

*Source: Authors Computation 2014*

**Table 3**

**Max eigenvalue statistic test**

| <b>maximum rank</b> | <b>parms</b> | <b>LL</b>  | <b>eigenvalue</b> | <b>max statistic</b> | <b>5% value</b> | <b>critical</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0                   | 20           | -805.64599 | .                 | 17.1542              | 27.07           |                 |
| 1                   | 27           | -797.06889 | 0.25604           | 10.4901              | 20.97           |                 |
| 2                   | 32           | -791.82381 | 0.16545           | 5.4063               | 14.07           |                 |
| 3                   | 35           | -789.12068 | 0.08900           | 1.0151               | 3.76            |                 |
| 4                   | 36           | -788.61315 | 0.01735           |                      |                 |                 |

*Source: Authors Computation 2014*

**Table 5**

**Max eigenvalue statistic test without macroeconomic variables**

| <b>Maximum Rank</b> | <b>parms</b> | <b>LL</b>  | <b>eigenvalue</b> | <b>max statistic</b> | <b>5% value</b> | <b>critical</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0                   | 6            | -514.51178 | .                 | 3.6718               | 14.07           |                 |
| 1                   | 9            | -512.67589 | 0.06134           | 1.7438               | 3.76            |                 |
| 2                   | 10           | -511.80399 | 0.02962           |                      |                 |                 |

*Source: Authors Computation 2014*

320

321

322

**Table 7**

| <b>Lag Selection-order Criteria</b> |          |         |    |                    |          |         |          |          |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------|----|--------------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Sample: April 09 – March 14         |          |         |    | Number of obs = 52 |          |         |          |          |
| lag                                 | LL       | LR      | df | p                  | FPE      | AIC     | HQIC     | SBIC     |
| 0                                   | -898.201 |         |    |                    | 1.4e+10  | 34.7    | 34.7576  | 34.8501  |
| 1                                   | -720.535 | 355.33  | 16 | 0.000              | 2.8e+07  | 28.4821 | 28.7698  | 29.2326* |
| 2                                   | -692.702 | 55.666  | 16 | 0.000              | 1.8e+07* | 28.027* | 28.5449* | 29.3779  |
| 3                                   | -687.673 | 10.059  | 16 | 0.864              | 2.8e+07  | 28.449  | 29.197   | 30.4002  |
| 4                                   | -671.875 | 31.597  | 16 | 0.011              | 3.0e+07  | 28.4567 | 29.4349  | 31.0083  |
| 5                                   | -653.76  | 36.229  | 16 | 0.003              | 3.0e+07  | 28.3754 | 29.5838  | 31.5274  |
| 6                                   | -646.914 | 13.691  | 16 | 0.622              | 5.0e+07  | 28.7275 | 30.166   | 32.4799  |
| 7                                   | -619.519 | 54.791  | 16 | 0.000              | 4.0e+07  | 28.2892 | 29.9579  | 32.642   |
| 8                                   | -598.81  | 41.417* | 16 | 0.000              | 4.7e+07  | 28.1081 | 30.007   | 33.0612  |

*Endogenous: Tea Price, NPK, CPI, ER*

*Exogenous: \_cons*

*Source: Authors Computation 2014*