111 EAAE-IAAE Seminar 'Small Farms: decline or persistence'

University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

26th - 27th June 2009

Technical efficiency of Organic Fertilizer in small farms of Nicaragua: 1998-2005

Carlos Alberto Zuniga González
Postal Address # 68 UNAN León Nicaragua
Email czuniga@unanleon.edu.ni czunigagonzales@gmail.com

Abstract

This article applies frontier production function analysis to small farms in Nicaragua during 1998-2005 (Battese and Coelli, 1988). The objective of this study is to estimate an average function that will provide a picture of the shape of the organic fertilizer technology of an average firm (in our case, agricultural production units). Furthermore I present a best-practice of organic fertilizer against which the efficiency of the firms within the primary sector can be measured (Coelli, T: 1995). The results show an average of technical efficiency acceptable which the makers of public policy in Nicaragua must considerer for the future. It is imperative if we consider an economy activity indexes that have increased during this period.

Keyword: Technical Efficiency; LSMS; Organic Fertilizer; Small Farm; Panel Data.

1 Introduction

As a developing country, Nicaragua has many technologies for small farm production systems which have been given by developed countries. We can see many technologies from traditional to conventional agricultural. So many traditional agricultural policies have encouraged small farmers to lower costs and/or raise income (Alvarez: 2003). Since the beginning of revolution process in Nicaragua, academics and policy maker have been interested in the relative efficiency of small farms in Latin America and Central and East Europe; for instance Gorton and Davidova, 2004: Battese and Coelli, 1995. Thus it is important, to clarify the definitions of terms efficiency and productivity. These words are often used interchangeably; however they are not precisely the same thing. The first defines the current state of technology in a small farm. The second can be achieved in two ways. One can either improve the state of the technology by inventing new ploughs, pesticides, rotations plan, etc. This is commonly referred to as technological change and can be represented by an upward shift in the production frontier. Alternatively one can implement procedures, such as improved small farmer education, to ensure farmers use the existing technology more efficiently (Coelli, 1995). My focal point will be the first terms.

Usually, some people use partial measures of efficiency of a small farm: for example litres of milk per cattle, kg of meat per head, yield per hectare and others. It has serious problems because they only consider either the land input or head of cattle and ignore all other input, such as labour, machinery, fuel, fertilizer, pesticide, capital, technology, education and others (Coelli:1995$_a$). Frequently, the public policy makers use this measure in formulating policy. As a result the efficiency measure is not included.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section 2, I review the literature on technical efficiency. Section 3, describes the stochastic frontier production model. Section 4, contains a description of the panel data. In section 5 I present the econometric estimation, and in section 6, I discuss some conclusions.

2 Technical efficiency: a review of the literature

All authors are in agreement that the recent history literature of efficiency measurement begins with Farrell (1957). He drew upon the work of Debreu (1951) and Koopmans (1951). It is approach considered a firm technically *efficient* if it obtains the maximum attainable output given the amount of inputs and the technology used and *allocative efficiency*, which reflects the ability of a firm to use the inputs in optimal proportions, given their respective prices. These two measures are then combined to provide a measure of total economic efficiency.

The successive authors to Farrell adjusted and extended his work[1]. Aigner and Chu (1968) measured the estimation of a parametric frontier production function in input/output space. They specified a Cobb-Douglas production function (in log form) for a sample of N firms as:

$$\ln(y_i) = F(x_i;\beta) - \mu_i \qquad , \qquad i = 1,2,\ldots\ldots,N \qquad (1)$$

where y_i is the output of the $i-th$ firm; x_i is the vector of input quantities used by the $i-th$ firm; β is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated; $F(,)$ denotes an appropriate function (in this instance the Cobb-Douglas); and μ_i is a non-negative variable representing inefficiency in

[1] Table 4 presents a list of authors and yours approach.

production. The parameters of the model were estimated using linear programming, $where\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i$ is minimized, subject to the constraints that $\mu_i\ >= 0,\ i = 1,2, \dots. N.$

The ratio of observed output of the $i - th$ firm, relative to the potential output defined by the estimated frontier, given the input vectorx_i, was suggested as an estimate of the technical efficiency of the $i - th$ firm:

$$TE_i = \frac{y_i}{\exp\left(F(x_i; \beta)\right)} = \exp(-\mu_i) \qquad (2)$$

This is an output-oriented calculate as opposed to the input-oriented measure discussed above. It indicates the magnitude of the output of the $i - th$ relative to the output that could be formed by the fully-efficient firm using the same input vector. The output- and input-orientated procedures provide equivalent measures of technical efficiency when constant returns to scale exist, but are unequal when increasing or decreasing returns to scale are present (Fare and Lovell: 1978).

Afriat, (1972) specified a model similar to (1), except that the μ_i were assumed to have a gamma distribution and the parameters of the model were estimated using the maximum likelihood (ML) method, Richmond (1974) noted that the parameters of Afriat´s model could also be estimated using a method that has become known as corrected ordinary least squares (COLS), where the ordinary least squares (OLS) method provides unbiased estimates of the slope parameters, and the (downward biased) OLS estimator of the intercept parameter is adjusted up the sample moments of the error distribution, obtained from the OLS residuals. Schmidt (1976) added to the discussion on ML frontiers observing that the linear and quadratic programming estimators proposed by Aigner and Chu (1968), are ML estimators if the μ_i were assumed to be distributed as exponential or half-normal random variables, respectively.

Timmer, (1971) attempts to address one of the primary criticisms of deterministic frontier estimators by making an adjustment to the Aigner and Chu (1968) method which involves dropping a percentage of firms closest to the estimated frontier, and re-estimating the frontier using the reduce sample. The arbitrary nature of the selection of some percentage of observations to omit has meant, however, that Timer's probabilistic frontier approach has not been widely followed. An alternative approach to the solution of the ´noise´ problem has, however, been widely adopted. This method is the subject of the following section on stochastic frontiers.

Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977) independently proposed the estimation of a stochastic frontier production function, where noise is accounted for by adding a symmetric error (v_i) to the non-negative error in (1) to provide:

$$\ln(y_i) = F(x_i; \beta) + v_i - \mu_i \qquad , i = 1,2, \dots, N \qquad (3)$$

The parameters of this model are estimated by ML, given suitable distributional assumptions for the error terms. Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977) assume that v_i has normal distribution and μ_i has either the half-normal or the exponential distribution.

3 Stochastic frontier production function model

The specifications of the model detailed in Battese and Coelli (1988, 1992 and 1995), and Battese, Coelli and Colby (1989) with the program FRONTIER Version 4.1 Coelli, 1996 is the method applied to obtain ML estimates. The Cobb-Douglas production function is estimating where log all the input and output data before creating the data file for using the program (Coelli, 1996). This model can be expressed in (3), Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977).

The program FRONTIER41 requires five files for his execution (Coelli, 1996): a) the executable file FRONTIER41.EXE, b)the start-up file FRONT41.000, c) A data file (in our case ee98-dta.txt, ee01-dta.txt, ee05-dta.txt), d) An instruction file (in our case ee98-ins.txt, ee01-ins.txt, ee05-ins.txt), e) An output file (in our case ee98-out.txt, ee01-out.txt, ee05-out.txt).

After typing ¨FRONT41¨ to begin the execution, the structure of the instruction file is listed as follow (e.g ee01-dta):

```
1            1=ERROR COMPONENTS MODEL, 2=TE EFFECTS MODEL
ee01-dta.txt       DATA FILE NAME
ee01-out.txt       OUTPUT FILE NAME
1                  1=PRODUCTION FUNCTION, 2=COST FUNCTION
y                  LOGGED DEPENDENT VARIABLE (Y/N)
22          NUMBER OF CROSS-SECTIONS
1           NUMBER OF TIME PERIODS
22          NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IN TOTAL
2           NUMBER OF REGRESSOR VARIABLES (Xs)
n            MU (Y/N) [OR DELTA0 (Y/N) IF USING TE EFFECTS MODEL]
n            ETA (Y/N) [OR NUMBER OF TE EFFECTS REGRESSORS (Zs)]
n            STARTING VALUES (Y/N)
            IF YES THEN     BETA0
                        BETA1 TO
                        BETAK
                        SIGMA SQUARED
                        GAMMA
                        MU          [OR DELTA0
                        ETA            DELTA1 TO
                                     DELTAP]

                        NOTE: IF YOU ARE SUPPLYING STARTING VALUES
                        AND YOU HAVE RESTRICTED MU [OR DELTA0] TO BE
                        ZERO THEN YOU SHOULD NOT SUPPLY A STARTING
                        VALUE FOR THIS PARAMETER.
```

Thus we estimate the Cobb-Douglas production frontier as follow:

$$\ln(Q_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(K_i) + \beta_2 ln(L_i) + (V_i - U_i), \qquad (4)$$

where Q_i, K_i and L_i are output, input capital and labour, respectively, and V_i and U_i are assumed normal and half-normal distributed, respectively. The text files ee98-dta, ee01-dta, ee05-dta contain 42, 22 and 48 observations respectively on firm-id, time-period, Q, K and L, in that order (refer to table 1).

Table 1: Exchange rate, Annual inflation and farm sample

LSMS Years	Exchange rate average (C$x US)	Annual Inflation (%)	Farm sample
1993	6.35	19.5	--------
1998	10.5821	18.5	42
2001	13.4438	4.7	22
2005	16.7333	9.58	48

Source: CBN and LSMS 93, 98, 01, 05.

4 Panel data

I use the survey of Living Standards Measurement Study LSMS[2] of the National Institute of Information and Development (NIID), (World Bank, 2006). NIID provide statistical information each five years beginning in 1993. Currently, we have the surveys of 1993, 1998, 2001 and 2005. The goals of NIID are identify the real data and corresponding documentation needed by policy analysts and researchers as well as how best to collect such information accurately from households. Therefore, I will be using it as the panel data, so I provide the output indicators for production function, the input indicators for capital and labour.

SSPS is the program that processes the information in each year where I make each panel data withQ_i, L_i andK_i . I consider exchange rates, annual inflation and sample as referred in table 1. Q_i Represents the output of the crop and livestock activities of each small farm expressed in dollars, K_i represents the total cost of organic fertilizer used by each small farm. It is expressed in dollars, and r L_i expresses the total labour of each the small farm, all these factors are expressed in dollars. This panel data permit simultaneously investigates both technical change and technical efficiency change over time (Coelli: 1995_b)

As soon as the information of panel data is processed when it is translated excel program and text file early mentioned in Battese and Coelli: 1995. The data is listed by observation. They are presented in the following order:

Firm number (an integer in the range 1 to N as refer table 1)
Period number (an integer in the range 1 to T, in our case is always 1 because this cross-sectional data.)
lnQ_{it}
lnL_{it}
lnK_{it}

Finally the program FRONTIER 4.1 is used for estimating the production function model where the dependent variable is logged.

[2] Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS), is widely recognized as a leader in introducing and improving integrated household surveys in developing countries. The LSMS has been an important effort of the World Bank Development Research Group (DECRG) for more than 20 years (World Bank, 2006)

5 Technical Efficiency Estimates

The mean technical efficiency had a diversity trend. In 1998, the small farms that apply organic fertilizer obtained a mean TE of 0.32, in 2001 it reached 0.62, however it reached to 0.24 in 2005 (refer to annex table 2). Possible reasons for this behaviour are prices, unfavorable climate condition and limited financial access. AEMI[3] during 1998 to 2005 increased to 112.7, 142.7 and 150.9 respectively for agricultural activity, and 110.1, 140.7 and 173.5 respectively for livestock activities. In addition, AFPI[4] also increased of 169.0, 199.3 and 283.6 respectively for 1998, 2001 and 2005 (CBN: 2008).

Using (4), we can see that the elasticity of the frontier production function was 0.68 and -0.16 for 1998, -0.12 and 0.31 for 2001 and 0.33 and 0.14 for 2005 respectively (refer to annex table 3).

Small farms during 1998 to 2005 the partial elasticity of the output (y) with respect to the cost of organic fertilizer was of 0.68, -0.12 and 0.33 in 1998, 2001 and 2005 respectively, so the perceptual change in the agricultural activities (output) allocated them a variation of 1 % in the input organic fertilizer keep on constant the input labour.

In addition, the partial elasticity of the output (y) with deference to the input labour was of -0.16, 0.31 and 0.14 in 1998, 2001 and 2005 respectively, so the labour measures perceptual change in the agricultural activities (output) allocated them a variation of 1 % keep on constant the cost of the organic fertilizer.

The returns to scale were as follow: a) the small farms obtained (0.5161) decreasing returns to scale when they duplicated the inputs, the agricultural activities will grow less of twice in 1998, b) the small farms obtained (0.1829) decreasing returns to scale when they duplicated the inputs the agricultural activities will grow less of twice in 2001, c) the small farms obtained (0.4856) decreasing returns to scale when they duplicated the inputs the agricultural activities will grow less of twice in 2005.

6 Conclusion

In the period of study, the small farms that have used organic fertilizer obtained decreasing returns to scale. The mean technical efficiency were not greater than 0.62. The elasticity of the agricultural production respect to the organic fertilizer and labour was less from 1. The small farms have efficiencies mean adequate although the public policy do not promote the use of organic fertilizer. The maker of public policy must consider this when they think about in local development.

On the other hand, the possible causes of the phenomenon were the climate conditions, limited access to credit, and traditional technology when the mean technical efficiency was lower than 0.50. The use of chemical fertilizer is a problem for contamination of soil and water however our small famers as yet aren´t convinced of it. Some small farmers use organic fertilizer although their profitability is low but they are convincing of your contribution to environment. It is an effort to the good agricultural practice that the maker public policy must include in their inputs.

[3] AEMI= Activity Economy of Monthly Index
[4] AFPI=Agricultural Farmer of Price Index

References

Aigner, D. J. and S.F. Chu (1968) ¨On Estimating the Industry Production Function¨, American Economic Review 58, 826-839.

Aigner, D. J., C.A. K Lovell and P. Schmidt (1977) ¨Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Production Function Models¨ , Journal of Econometric 6, 21-37.

Álvarez, Antonio. Arias, Carlos. 2003. Technical efficiency and farm size: a conditional analysis. Department of Economics: University of Oviedo, Spain. Department of Economics: University of León, Spain. Agri. Econ. 30 (2004) pp 241-250

Afriat, S.N. (1972), ¨Efficiency Estimation of Production Functions¨ International Economic Review 13, 568-598.

Battese, G.E. and Coelli, T.J. (1988), ´Prediction of Firm-Level Technical efficiencies with a Generalized Frontier Production Function and Panel Data¨, Journal of Econometrics, 38, 387-399.

Battese, G.E., Coelli, T.J. and Colby, T.C (1989), ¨Estimation of Frontier Production Function and the Efficiencies of Indian Farms Using Panel Data From ICRISAT´s Village Level Studies¨, Journal of Quantitative Economics, 5, 327-348.

Battese, G.E. and Coelli, T.J. (1992), ¨Frontier Production Functions, Technical Efficiency and Panel Data: With Application to Paddy Farmers in India¨, Journal of Productivity Analysis, 3, 153-169.

Battese, G.E. and Coelli, T.J. (1995), ¨A Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in a Stochastic Frontier Production for Panel Data¨, Empirical economics, 20, 325-332.

Central Bank of Nicaragua, (2008) ¨Economic Indicators June 2008¨ pp 09 and 41

Coelli, T.J. (1995_a), ¨Estimator and Hypothesis Test for a Stochastic Frontier Function: A Monte Carlo Analysis¨, Journal of Productivity Analysis, 6 , 247-268.

Coelli, T.J. (1995_b), ¨Recent developments in Frontier modeling and efficiency measurement¨ Department of Econometrics, University of New England, Armidale, NSW. Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 39.No. 3 (December 1995), 219-245

Coelli, T.J. (1996), ¨A guide to Frontier Version 4.1: A Computer Program for Stochastic Frontier Production and Cost Function Estimation¨. Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis (CEPA) Working Paper No 96/07. Department of Econometrics University of New England Armidale NSW 2351, Australia. http://www.une.edu.au/econometrics/cepawp.htm

Debreu, G. (1951), ¨The coefficient of Resource Utilization¨, Econometrica 19, 273-292.

Farrell, M.J., (1957). ¨The measurement of productive efficiency¨, Journal of the Royal: Statistical Society. A CXX, Part (3), 253-290.

Fare, R. and C.A.K. Lovell.,(1978) ¨Measuring the Technical Efficiency of Production¨ Journal of Economic Theory 19, 150-162.

Gorton, M. Davidova, Sophia. 2004. Farm productivity and efficiency in the CEE applicant countries: a synthesis of results. Agri. Econ. 30 (2004) 1-16.

Koopmans, T.C. (1951), ¨An Analysis of Production as an Efficient Combination of Activities¨, in T.C Koopmans, Ed., Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation, Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, Monograph No. 13, Wiley. New York.

Meeusen, W. and J. van den Broeck (1977) ¨Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production Functions With Composed Error¨, International Economic Review 18, 435-444.

Richmond, J. (1974) Estimating the Efficiency of Production¨ International Economic Review 15, 515-521.

Schmidt, P. (1976), ¨On the Statistical Estimation of Parametric Frontier Production Functions¨, The Review of Economics and Statistics 58, 238-239.

Timmer, C.P. (1971), ¨Using a Probabilistic Frontier Function to Measure Technical Efficiency¨ Journal of Political Economy 79, 776-794.

World Bank, (2006) ¨LSMS IV: Research for Improving Survey Data. Poverty Group¨ DECRG, January 2006.

Zuniga, C.A., (2009). Wages and employs for non-farm agricultural activities: a livelihood strategy in Nicaragua. 111th EAAE-IAAE Seminar 'Small Farms: decline or persistence' University of Kent, Canterbury, UK 26th -27th, June 2009.

Annex

Table 2: Technical efficiency estimate by year and firm (Agricultural Unit Production)

1998		2001		2005	
Cod LSLM	Eff. Est	Cod LSLM	Eff. Est	Cod LSLM	Eff. Est
44800	0.27587582E+00	727	0.58435054E+00	813	0.63195969E+00
53800	0.45539402E+00	780	0.76754498E+00	814	0.98470029E-01
60600	0.19669639E+00	782	0.35779096E+00	949	0.10890517E-01
60700	0.20861501E+00	813	0.73728061E+00	978	0.41034025E-01
164600	0.20010149E+00	1058	0.66503258E+00	1060	0.47103932E+00
225000	0.44527360E+00	1157	0.68710254E+00	1100	0.95126428E-01
225300	0.50003614E+00	1317	0.72234939E+00	1118	0.81505860E-01
226700	0.50149960E+00	1320	0.56242032E+00	1119	0.15630801E-01
228000	0.19927807E+00	1330	0.43083492E+00	1120	0.34570595E-01
286600	0.43322370E+00	1382	0.54758716E+00	1147	0.39064303E+00
363600	0.21364826E+00	1737	0.55396471E+00	1267	0.48209897E+00
368100	0.30248142E+00	2101	0.69421311E+00	1412	0.19760349E-01
372300	0.70110634E-01	2561	0.61684623E+00	1458	0.24196026E-01
372400	0.34234618E+00	3287	0.73788183E+00	1591	0.81829340E-01
398500	0.27880242E+00	3859	0.78276409E+00	1660	0.14657910E+00
403300	0.12467686E+00	4019	0.51529052E+00	1685	0.40003259E+00
439100	0.53788311E+00	4150	0.65310611E+00	1700	0.21585076E-01
439101	0.45616531E+00	4291	0.53159551E+00	1917	0.10252029E+00
440900	0.99196268E-01	4300	0.52916993E+00	2179	0.36184029E-01
441500	0.31534888E+00	4375	0.60923318E+00	2279	0.97145070E-01
442910	0.37622531E+00	4387	0.68057842E+00	2280	0.88683760E-02
445200	0.47326049E+00	4303	0.75129323E+00	2646	0.14576869E-01
443000	0.26644029E+00			2698	0.14423565E+00
443200	0.30042213E+00			2716	0.35164372E+00
443300	0.56203407E+00			2784	0.35882877E+00
445200	0.64185264E+00			2854	0.52697778E+00
446500	0.24235634E+00			2963	0.18201504E+00
446600	0.11863627E+00			3252	0.37735282E-02
448700	0.47546522E+00			3346	0.68892112E+00
449300	0.97912026E-01			3613	0.45522480E+00
449600	0.48400653E+00			4004	0.54992002E+00
450500	0.33116249E+00			4336	0.47457774E+00
451000	0.42074982E+00			6065	0.29962025E+00
451200	0.22234542E-01			6070	0.65374034E+00
451400	0.43103199E+00			6141	0.64634913E-01
451500	0.63157428E+00			6888	0.80658911E+00
451900	0.55066837E+00			7547	0.34759975E-01
457800	0.42461867E+00			7818	0.68869324E+00
461300	0.62471491E-01			7835	0.13023163E-01
461310	0.82274398E-01			7844	0.59027102E+00
463300	0.26793699E+00			8155	0.12631525E-01
596300	0.30377191E+00			8296	0.14355671E-01
				8323	0.76823809E+00
				8329	0.81632570E-01
				8460	0.51073839E-02
				8836	0.81273970E-01
				8903	0.40645877E+00
				10215	0.44423522E-01
Mean efficiency	0.32675618E+00		0.62355595E+00		0.24182954E+00

Note: The Cod LSMS keep up a correspondence to ID of each small farm of the data base.

Table 3: The final mle estimates, LR test and log likelihood function by year

Parameter/Years	Coefficient	Standard – error	t-ratio
1998			
Beta 0	0.51257171E+01	0.22646486E+01	0.22633610E+01
Beta 1	0.68177627E+00	0.27656399E+00	0.24651665E+01
Beta 2	-0.16564550E+00	0.10974495E+00	0.16123173E+01
Sigma-Squared	0.60844150E+01	0.10351238E+01	0.46566710E+01
Gamma	0.70550210E+00	0.18676191E+00	0.15753986E+01
Mu is restricted to be zero			
Eta is restricted to be zero			
Log likelihood function = -0.75582499E+03			
LR test of the one-sided error = 0.29559405E+00			
2001			
Beta 0	0.66124564E+01	0.19184257E+01	0.34468139E+01
Beta 1	-0.12634720E+00	0.25247873E+00	-0.50042710E+00
Beta 2	0.30927510E+00	0.14484356E+00	0.21352354E+01
Sigma-Squared	0.94582114E+00	0.12806942E+01	0.73852224E+00
Gamma	0.49469860E+00	0.13786277E+01	0.35883407E+00
Mu is restricted to be zero			
Eta is restricted to be zero			
Log likelihood function = -0.26406868E+02			
LR test of the one-sided error = 0.32918825E-01			
2005			
Beta 0	0.61366553E+01	0.70250379E+00	0.87354053E+01
Beta 1	0.33620030E+00	0.13128292E+00	0.25608838E+01
Beta 2	0.14294425E+00	0.11581727E+00	0.12342222E+01
Sigma-Squard	0.85436689E+01	0.21549854E+01	0.39646065E+01
Gamma	0.97295128E+00	0.28514026E-01	0.34121849E+02
Mu is restricted to be zero			
Eta is restricted to be zero			
Log likelihood function = -0.92214279E+02			
LR test of the one-sided error = 0.20078413E+01			

Source: Panel data 1998 to 2005

Table 4: Outline of efficiency measurement approach by authors

Authors	Year	Approach
Debreu Koopmans	1951 1951	Simple measure of firm efficiency which could account for multiple inputs
Farrel	1957	Technical efficiency and price efficiency (allocative efficiency)= overall efficiency (economic efficiency)
Aigner and Chu	1968	Specified a Cobb-Douglas production function (in log form) for a sample of N firms
Fare and Lovell	1978	Output-orientated measure as opposed to the input-oriented before
Afriat	1972	Specified a model similar a Aigner, except μ_i estimated by ML
Richmond	1974	Corrected Ordinary Least Square COLS
Schmidt	1976	ML frontier
Timmer	1971	Re-estimating the frontier using the reduced sample
Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt and Meeusen and van den Broeck	1977	Estimation of a stochastic frontier production function
Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt	1977	Assume that v_i has normal distribution and μ_i has either the half – normal or the exponential distribution
Steveson	1980	Specification of more general distributional forms: truncated-normal
Greene	1990	Two-parameter gamma
Greene	1980_a	Particular class of distribution could be assumed for the μ_i ,which circumvent these regularity problem. The noise criticism, however, would still remain
Greene	1992	Software LIMDEP econometric package automate ML method
Coelli	1992-94	FRONTIER PROGRAM automate ML method
Schmidt and Waldman	1980	Finite sample properties of the half-normal frontier model are investigated in Monte Carlos experiment in Olsen: sample sizes smaller than 400
Coelli	1992	Computer program for stochastic frontier Version 4.1
Coelli	1995_a	Recent developments in frontier modeling and efficiency measurement
Coelli	1995_b	The ML estimator should be used in preference to the COLS

Source: Author´s outline