



AgEcon SEARCH

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.



The Roles of Agroclimatic Similarity and Returns to Scale in the Demand for Mechanization: Insights from Northern Nigeria

H. Takeshima;

International Food Policy Research Institute, , United States of America

Corresponding author email: H.takeshima@cgiar.org

Abstract:

Despite economic transformations and urbanization, declining shares of the workforce employed in the agricultural sector, production costs in the agricultural sector and food prices remain high in Nigeria relative to those in some of the other developing countries. Understanding how the adoption of mechanical technologies is related to agricultural productivity is therefore important for countries like Nigeria. Using farm household data from northern Nigeria as well as various spatial agroclimatic data, this study shows that the adoption of key mechanical technologies in Nigerian agriculture (animal traction, tractors, or both) has been high in areas that are more agroclimatically similar to the locations of agricultural research and development (R&D) stations, and this effect is heterogeneous, being particularly strong among relatively larger farms. Furthermore, such effects are likely to have been driven by the rise in returns on scale in the underlying production function caused by the adoption of these mechanical technologies. Agricultural mechanization, represented here as the switch from manual labor to animal traction and tractors, has been not only raising the average return on scale but also potentially magnifying the effects of productivity-enhancing public-sector R&D on spatial variations in agricultural productivity in countries like Nigeria.

Acknowledgment: This work was undertaken as part of and funded by the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (PIM), which is led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and funded by CGIAR Fund donors, the United States Agency for International Development Food Security Policy project, the Syngenta Foundation, and IFPRI's Nigeria Strategy Support Program. This paper has not undergone IFPRI's standard peer-review process. The opinions expressed here belong to the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of PIM, IFPRI, or CGIAR. The authors are solely responsible for all remaining errors.

JEL Codes: Q12, D24

#705



The Roles of Agroclimatic Similarity and Returns to Scale in the Demand for Mechanization: Insights from Northern Nigeria

Abstract: Despite economic transformations and urbanization, declining shares of the workforce employed in the agricultural sector, production costs in the agricultural sector and food prices remain high in Nigeria relative to those in some of the other developing countries. Understanding how the adoption of mechanical technologies is related to agricultural productivity is therefore important for countries like Nigeria. Using farm household data from northern Nigeria as well as various spatial agroclimatic data, this study shows that the adoption of key mechanical technologies in Nigerian agriculture (animal traction, tractors, or both) has been high in areas that are more agroclimatically similar to the locations of agricultural research and development (R&D) stations, and this effect is heterogeneous, being particularly strong among relatively larger farms. Furthermore, such effects are likely to have been driven by the rise in returns on scale in the underlying production function caused by the adoption of these mechanical technologies. Agricultural mechanization, represented here as the switch from manual labor to animal traction and tractors, has been not only raising the average return on scale but also potentially magnifying the effects of productivity-enhancing public-sector R&D on spatial variations in agricultural productivity in countries like Nigeria.

Keywords: agricultural mechanization, agroclimatic similarity, returns on scale, inverse-probability weighting, Nigeria

1 Background

A growing number of developing countries, including those in Africa south of the Sahara (SSA), such as Nigeria, have experienced seeming economic transformations recently, characterized by declining shares of the gross domestic product (GDP) originating from the agricultural sector and rising shares from the nonagricultural sector, accompanied by movement of the labor force out of the agricultural sector (ACET 2014; Takeshima 2017b). Accompanying such transformations, agricultural mechanization has gradually progressed in countries like Nigeria, particularly intermediate modes of mechanization such as animal traction. However, the adoption of mechanical technologies in Nigeria is still relatively limited at the intensive margins (Takeshima 2017b). Understanding the agricultural productivity growth that is both causing and triggered by such a gradual growth of mechanization is important for a country like Nigeria.

Public-sector agricultural research and development (R&D) aimed at raising overall productivity, including plant breeding, is a potentially important determinant for the adoption of agricultural mechanization because, historically, the public sector has played a relatively more important role in plant breeding than in R&D for other inputs, including mechanical technologies, which have been relatively more directly transferable from abroad (Evenson 1988). Because of their public sector–led nature, agricultural R&D systems have provided significant exogenous variations in agricultural productivity in addition to the existing agroclimatic diversity in countries like Nigeria, whereby agricultural productivity is positively associated with “agroclimatic similarity,” the similarity in agroclimatic conditions between the areas where farms are located and the areas where major plant breeding institutes are located (Takeshima and Nasir 2017). Furthermore, agricultural R&D centered on plant breeding has often raised the total factor productivity (TFP) (Evenson and Gollin 2003; Walker and Alwang 2015) with potentially Hicks-neutral effects, so that it has also often raised the returns on farm power inputs, complementing rather than substituting for the use of mechanical technologies. Such mechanisms may partly explain why agricultural mechanization has grown rapidly in developing countries in Asia despite land scarcity and persistent smallholder dominance there, primarily through the spread of small-scale machinery (Biggs and Justice 2015).

Agricultural mechanization itself has been generally scale biased, often complementary to farm size; that is, adoption of mechanical technologies is often higher among larger farms than among smaller farms. A recent study has suggested that in Nepal, tractor adoption directly raises

the return-to-scale (RTS) of the underlying production function (Takeshima 2017). These phenomena suggest that the interaction effects of agroclimatic similarity and production scale (particularly farm size) play an important role in the adoption of mechanical technologies.

Although such interaction effects on the adoption of mechanical technologies are intuitive, evidence has been scarce, especially in countries like Nigeria. Formally investigating these relationships is important for many reasons. If the interaction effects of agroclimatic similarity and farm size are significant, even if agroclimatic similarity alone has, on average, an insignificant effect, there may be considerable heterogeneity in its effects by different production scales (farm sizes). If mechanical technologies have an important scale bias, then their effects are likely to be magnified as mechanization progresses. It is also important to formally investigate whether the rise in RTS is directly attributable to the adoption of mechanical technologies, because such a rise can also be caused by factors other than mechanization. For example, several studies have associated the emergence of large farms in developing countries with the spread of improved varieties that are resistant to pests (Deininger and Byerlee 2012), specialization, land consolidation (Wan and Cheung 2001), and a change of crop mix (Cramb 2011). However, if the adoption of mechanization technologies is directly responsible for the rise in RTS, then the rise in RTS and subsequent effects in the agricultural sector would be expected to kick in at a specific stage of agricultural development—that is, the stage when the mechanical technologies are becoming increasingly adopted, which has historically been relatively short in many countries¹—and not at any other stages.

This paper tests these hypotheses using the data of farm households in Nigeria from the Living Standards Measurement Study–Integrated Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) (LSMS, various years) as well as the locations of agricultural R&D stations that focus on plant breeding and various spatial agroclimatic data. Our results are consistent with the aforementioned hypotheses in that the adoption of key mechanical technologies in agriculture in Nigeria (animal traction, tractors, or both) has been high in areas with higher agroclimatic similarity to agricultural R&D stations, and this effect has been heterogeneous, being particularly strong among relatively larger farms. Furthermore, these effects are likely to have been driven by the

¹ For example, in the United States, tractor adoption rates, as measured by the percentage of farmers owning tractors, increased from 14 percent to 50 percent in 20 years (1930 to 1950) (Olmstead & Rhode 2001). In Japan, the adoption of power tillers and of planting and harvesting machines increased from about 10 percent to almost 100 percent in 15 years (1955–1965) (Economic Planning Agency 1962; Barker et al. 1985).

fact that the adoption of these mechanical technologies has been directly causing the rise in RTS in the underlying production function.

This study contributes to various strands of the literature. It sheds new light on the adoption patterns of mechanical technologies by investigating the linkages between farming-system intensification and agricultural mechanization (Binswanger 1986; Diao, Silver, and Takeshima 2016). It also relates to the literature on animal traction in developing countries (Lawrence and Pearson 2002), including countries in Africa (Jaeger and Matlon 1990; Jansen 1993; Ehui and Polson 1993), as well as the literature on tractors (Diao et al. 2014; Takeshima, Nin-Pratt, and Diao 2013). This study also complements the literature assessing the RTS in agricultural production and its variations over time and space (Hayami and Kawagoe 1989; Kislev and Peterson 1996; Basu 2008; Takeshima 2017; Takeshima, Houssou, and Diao 2017). The paper also links agricultural mechanization to agricultural R&D in Africa on technologies other than machinery, such as plant breeding, which raises varietal technology and overall productivity (Walker and Alwang 2015).

This study does not directly address the questions and hypotheses raised by these past studies. Instead, it provides evidence that connects these strands of literature, highlighting that agricultural transformation has historically involved a rise in overall RTS (with both positive and potentially negative effects), and that domestic public-sector R&D has had important effects on the geographic variations in agricultural productivity. Agricultural mechanization, represented here as the switch from manual labor to animal traction and tractors, has been not only raising the average RTS but also potentially magnifying the role of productivity-enhancing public-sector R&D on the spatial variations in agricultural productivity in countries like Nigeria.

This paper is structured in the following way. Section 2 describes the empirical framework. Section 3 describes the dataset and variables as well as presenting key descriptive statistics. Section 4 discusses the results and implications, and Section 5 concludes.

2 Empirical Framework²

One of the common measures of RTS is the sum of the output elasticities of all inputs in a production function (Kislev and Peterson 1996). The effect of the adoption of mechanical

² The descriptions in this section largely draw on Takeshima (2017).

technologies (animal traction or tractors) on RTS can be estimated using the following framework.³ We start by illustrating the condition for a farm household that belongs to one of two production systems: (1) with mechanized technologies (denoted as regime $R = 1$) and (2) without mechanized technologies ($R = 0$). Agricultural production, Y , for each farm household is realized in one of the R s so that

$$Y = \begin{cases} f_1(K_1; A) & \text{if } R = 1 \\ f_0(K_0; A) & \text{if } R = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In equation (1), f_R is a regime-specific production function with vector K_R of inputs / production factors, given agroclimatic and socioeconomic conditions A . Farm households decide to adopt mechanical technologies, or not, by choosing R and K_R that maximize their utility, U , which depends on agricultural profit, π :

$$\max_{R, K_R} U(\pi), \quad (2)$$

where

$$\pi = R \cdot [f_1 \cdot (K_1; A) - c_1(\omega, K_1)] + (1 - R) \cdot [f_0 \cdot (K_0; A) - c_0(\omega, K_0)]. \quad (3)$$

In equation (3), $c_R(\omega, K_R)$ is the cost of using inputs and production factors K_R given ω (factors affecting inputs costs, including the opportunity costs of family labor), standardized by setting the price of composite outputs at 1.

Utility maximization problems (2) and (3) are solved with a set of constraints (including liquidity constraints),

³ Our analyses treat animal traction and tractors jointly as “mechanical technologies” instead of distinguishing them because, as shown in the previous section, the adoption rate of tractors is considerably lower than the adoption rate of animal traction in Nigeria, and the data are not suitable for analyzing their differential effects. Furthermore, a farm typology analysis by Takeshima, Nin-Pratt, and Diao (2013) revealed that animal traction and tractors may be generally used as substitutes, particularly in northern Nigeria, with the switch from animal traction to tractors not associated with substantial changes in the production system.

$$g_R(K_R, A, \omega, \eta) \geq 0, \forall R, \quad (4)$$

where η is a set of factors that affect the liquidity of the farm household. Importantly, both c_R and g_R vary across regime R .

The optimization problems above lead to the Lagrange function \mathcal{L}_R ,

$$\mathcal{L}_R = U[f_R(K_R; A) - c_R(\omega, K_R)] + \lambda_R \cdot g_R(K_R, A, \omega, \eta), \forall R, \quad (5)$$

where λ_R is the Lagrange multiplier. The optimal solutions for K_R^* (asterisks indicate the solution values) satisfy the corresponding Kuhn-Tucker conditions. Because the Kuhn-Tucker conditions depend on f_R , c_R , g_R , A , ω , and η , and parameters defining f_R , c_R , and g_R are also functions of A , ω , and η , our empirical models are the following reduced-form equations:

$$R^* = r(f_R, c_R, g_R, A, \omega, \eta) = r(A, \omega, \eta) \text{ and} \quad (6)$$

$$K_R^* = k(f_R, c_R, g_R, A, \omega, \eta, R^*) = r(A, \omega, \eta, R^*), \quad (7)$$

with respective functions r and k . Observed output Y_R^* is related to K_R^* through structural equation f_R , so that $Y_R^* = f_R(K_R^*; A, R^*)$.

The Roles of Agroclimatic Similarity and Farm Size in the Adoption of Mechanical Technologies

Suppose an increased agroclimatic similarity with agricultural R&D institutions leads to a Hicks-neutral productivity increase through Δ , so that production function f_R is proportionally shifted to $\Delta \cdot f_R$. Even when the adoption of mechanical technologies has no effect on f_R (so that $f_1 \equiv f_0$), the increase in productivity through Δ will increase the optimal use of K_1 , which includes farm power, because the marginal returns from using K_R , $\frac{\partial f_R}{\partial K_R}$, rise for all values of K_R relative to the marginal cost of using K_R , $\frac{\partial c_R}{\partial K_R}$. At the same time, the mechanical technologies are more efficient at supplying greater farm power. The higher the farm power use, K_R , the lower

$\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial K_1}$ is than $\frac{\partial c_0}{\partial K_0}$, relatively speaking. Therefore, Hicks-neutral productivity growth, represented by Δ , is more likely to induce a switch from regime 0 to regime 1 as Δ rises and as optimal farm power use, K_1 , rises.

Furthermore, farm power use is generally positively associated with the farm size. Therefore, a 1-unit increase in Δ generally leads to a greater increase in optimal farm power use among large farms than among smaller farms. Therefore, larger farms are more likely to see their optimal farm power use exceed the threshold at which the switch from regime 0 to 1 is induced. Such mechanisms suggest that there is a positive interaction effect of Δ and farm size on the probability of switching from regime 0 to regime 1, that is, the probability of adopting mechanical technologies.

Generally, these relationships become further reinforced if the adoption of mechanical technologies raises RTS so that f_1 exhibits greater RTS than f_0 . This effect happens because the effects of Δ on the marginal productivity of K_1 in regime 1, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial K_1}$, become relatively greater at higher K_1 than at lower K_1 . Therefore, if the adoption of mechanical technologies also raises RTS in f_1 , the aforementioned interaction effects of Δ and farm size are likely to become stronger.

Empirical Approach

Effects of Agroclimatic Similarity and Farm Size on the Adoption of Animal Traction or Tractors

The first empirical model estimates equation (6) in a somewhat more structured way. Specifically, following the conceptual framework above, we estimate (6) through a panel fixed-effects linear probability model, using agroclimatic similarity, farm size, and their interaction as key variables, as well as other control variables:

$$R_{it} = \alpha + \alpha_x \cdot (A_{it}, \omega_{it}, \eta_{it}) + r_i + v_{it}, \quad (8)$$

where i and t are households and survey rounds, respectively; α and α_x are estimated parameters; r_i is unobserved time-invariant household-specific effects; v_{it} is idiosyncratic errors; and $(A_{it}, \omega_{it}, \eta_{it})$ is a vector of a subset of exogenous variables (including agroclimatic similarity, farm size, and their interaction) that are time variant. Parameter α also includes a

dummy variable for the survey round. For simplicity, we suppress subscripts i and t hereafter. Appendix A discusses how the index of agroclimatic similarity is constructed.

Effects of the Adoption of Animal Traction, Tractors, or Both on Returns on Scale

Two types of endogeneity issues are associated with the framework described above: the endogeneity due to farm households' self-selection to adopt mechanical technologies and the endogeneity in observed inputs / factor use decisions in estimating the production function. Following recent studies such as the one by Takeshima (2017), we employ the inverse probability-weighted generalized method of moments (IPW-GMM) to address these issues jointly.

Specifically, we first estimate the probability that the farm household adopts mechanical technologies (animal traction or tractors) through probit,

$$\text{Probability } (R^* = 1|Z) = \hat{p} = \Phi(Z\gamma) = \int_{-\infty}^{Z\gamma} \phi(v)dv, \quad (9)$$

where $Z = A, \omega$, and η ; \hat{p} is the predicted probability of the adoption of mechanical technologies; and γ is the set of parameters to be estimated. Φ and ϕ are the standard normal distribution function and standard normal density function, respectively, and v is the element for the latter. Equation (9) is estimated simply to obtain \hat{p} , and the determinants of adoption are investigated by equation (8).

We then estimate f_R and its corresponding RTS, ρ_R , for each R , given the observed Y, R, K_R, A, ω , and η . Specifically, we estimate the Cobb-Douglas production function

$$\ln Y = \beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j \ln K_j + \beta_A A + \varepsilon, \quad (10)$$

in which β s are parameters to be estimated (with corresponding subscripts); ε is the idiosyncratic error term; and $j =$ labor, land, agricultural equipment, value of livestock, and other cash expenses (including expenses on hired animal traction or tractors). Then $\widehat{\rho}_R = \sum_j \widehat{\beta}_j$.

The IPW-GMM is operationalized by estimating the β variables in equation (10) through

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \left[E \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\hat{p}}} \right) \right] \widehat{W} \left[E \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\hat{p}}} \right) \right]' \quad (11)$$

for the adopters of mechanical technologies and

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \left[E \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{1-\hat{p}}} \right) \right] \widehat{W} \left[E \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{1-\hat{p}}} \right) \right]' \quad (12)$$

for nonadopters, where E is the expectation over samples; \widehat{W} is the suitable weighting matrix estimated in the generalized method of moments; and $m(\cdot)$ is the moment condition,

$$m(\cdot) = Z' [\ln Y - (\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j \ln K_j + \beta_A A)]. \quad (13)$$

IPW-GMM is “doubly robust” (Robins and Rotnitzky 1995) because the overall model is consistent as long as either the model of the propensity score, \hat{p} , or the model of the production function is consistent, even when the other model is misspecified.

Other Specification Issues

Although our primary dataset, LSMS-ISA (LSMS, various years), provides panel data for farm households, our estimation of RTS by equations (9) through (13) treats them as pooled cross-section data because RTS is often regarded as a long-run rather than a short-run concept, and cross-section data (with methods addressing endogeneity) may be more appropriate than fixed-effects and first-difference models, which are more suitable for capturing short-run effects (Basu 2008; Takeshima 2017). This approach treats the same farm households in different rounds of the survey as different farm households, due to changes over time in land endowments and demographics as well as unobserved individual-specific effects, including ability or management skills. This treatment is also suitable for the application of IPW-GMM, which requires estimation of regime-specific production functions using samples in each regime, R , and allows farm households to switch regime between survey rounds. Similar approaches have been used in other studies, including Takeshima (2017).

3 Data and Variables

The primary data source used in this analysis is the LSMS-ISA (LSMS, various years), which was collected jointly by the National Bureau of Statistics of Nigeria and the World Bank. The data consist of a total of 5,000 panel households interviewed in three waves (2010/2011, 2012/2013, and 2015/2016) and selected across each of six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. The samples were selected through stratified sampling methods in which 10 randomly selected households within each of 500 enumeration areas (EAs) were interviewed.

Our analyses focus on a subsample of the LSMS-ISA, specifically, the farm households that (1) reported information on at least one farm plot in each of the three waves and (2) were located in northern Nigeria (including the North West, North East, and North Central zones). We focus on northern Nigeria because the adoption rates of mechanical technologies in the southern area (the South East, South South, and South West zones) are very low and its farming systems (based on root and tree crops) are quite different from those in northern Nigeria (based on cereals).

Due to the space limitations, further discussions of the sampling and the set of explanatory variables, are provided in Takeshima (2017b, section 4).

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 summarizes the mean value of each variable used in the analysis and its statistical significance between the samples of adopters and nonadopters. It shows the descriptive statistics with and without probability weights (\hat{p}), which are estimated in the next section, because this method demonstrates improvements in the matching properties of the samples realized through the IPW process. With probability weights, the differences become statistically insignificant for most exogenous variables, suggesting that the IPW process successfully generated matched samples. Any differences in production functions and RTS between the two groups, as shown in the next section, can thereby be more precisely attributed to the adoption of mechanical technologies.

Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics (raw samples and inverse probability-weighted samples)

Category/variable	Raw sample		IPW-adjusted sample	
	Adopte	Nonado	Adopte	Nonado
	rs	pters	rs	pters
Sample size	1,784	1,785	1,784	1,785

Endogenous variables				
ln (Real revenue of outputs)	9.104	8.702**	9.067	8.977
ln (Labor use) (person-day per year)	5.547	5.562	5.531	5.439
ln (Land) (square meters)	9.245	9.019**	9.200	8.980 *
ln (Other expenditures for purchased inputs)	3.592	2.261**	3.316	2.774 *
Exogenous variables				
EA sample share of mechanical technology adopters	0.666	0.323**	0.520	0.533
EA sample share of mechanical technology adopters, squared	0.528	0.165**	0.374	0.387
ln (real local price of beef)	2.048	2.065	2.056	2.066
ln (real local price of milk)	0.388	0.318**	0.363	0.395
ln (real value of agricultural equipment owned)	1.953	1.562**	1.720	1.843
ln (real value of livestock owned)	5.627	3.927**	4.803	4.953
Pasture area per head of livestock (index)	0.187	0.309**	0.254	0.242
EA average animal traction use intensity (animal-days/farm)	8.341	2.410**	6.148	7.919
ln (animal traction rental cost per day)	3.218	3.235	3.242	3.227 †
ln (number of male adult household members ≥ 20 years old)	0.219	0.160*	0.190	0.158
ln (number of female adult household members ≥ 20 years old)	0.268	0.244	0.265	0.184
ln (number of child household members)	1.105	0.917**	1.071	0.983
Age of household head	48.019	48.540	48.019	47.205
Distance to market (minutes of travel time)	70.2595	71.154	71.413	71.793
Distance to administrative center (minutes of travel time)	94.289	92.155	93.545	91.847
ln (area of farmland purchased outright), ha	-2.913	-3.530**	-3.185	-3.336
ln (area of farmland distributed by the chief), ha	2.876	2.487†	2.754	2.592
ln (real price of chemical fertilizer)	0.022	-0.007	0.011	0.060
ln (real daily farm wage for an adult male worker)	1.665	1.666	1.664	1.660
ln (real value of household assets)	7.976	7.580**	7.867	7.847
Share of noneducated working-age household members	0.462	0.511**	0.490	0.518
Soil bulk density (MT/m ³)	1.383	1.347**	1.371	1.373
Soil silt composition (%)	20.953	20.466*	20.824	20.374
Soil sand composition (%)	64.371	62.752**	63.900	64.331
Soil acidity (pH)	6.403	6.260**	6.360	6.331
Soil organic contents (g/kg of soil)	7.024	7.816**	7.300	7.256
Euclidean distance to ARS (geographic minutes)	2.509	2.725**	2.575	2.538
Euclidean distance to nearest river (geographic minutes)	0.0173	0.0165*	0.01707	0.01668
Euclidean distance to dam (geographic minutes)	0.6261	0.6444	0.629	0.638
Rainfall (historical average, long term, mm)	872.531	931.193**	895.970	889.985
Rainfall (historical standard deviation, mm)	151.154	149.770†	151.955	149.757 *
Rainfall in April (mm)	20.589	23.208**	21.00	19.87
Rainfall in May (mm)	63.4	67.0†	64.45	64.60
Wind (10-meter height, annual average, m/s)	2.959	2.883**	2.916	2.928
Solar radiation (kWh/m ² , annual average)	5.802	5.742**	5.774	5.775
Slope (%)	2.078	2.640**	2.241	2.234
Terrain ruggedness (index)	34.750	39.622**	35.073	35.673
% surveyed in Wave 1 (2010/2011)	27.77	37.67**	34.00	31.31
% surveyed in Wave 2 (2012/2013)	38.42	30.79**	32.60	37.16
% surveyed in Wave 3 (2015/2016)	33.80	31.54	33.40	31.53

Source: Authors' estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Note: Statistical significance: † 10 percent, * 5 percent, ** 1 percent. ARS = agricultural research station; IPW = inverse probability weighting. All monetary values are deflated by the average local prices of rice and *gari* (a granular product of cassava), two of the most commonly consumed staples in Nigeria (Gyimah-Brempong et al. 2016), to control for potential variations in the price index across space.

4 Results

Relationship of Adoption Rates to Agroclimatic Similarity and Farm Size

Table 5.1 shows the estimated effects of farm size, agroclimatic similarity, and their interaction on the adoption of mechanical technologies (animal traction, tractors, or both). Following Takeshima and Nasir (2017), we also show the robustness of the estimated results across various measures of agroclimatic similarity. Specifically, we use the following four versions: (a) “primary specifications,” where D_i in equation (A2) is the average, so that $D_i = \sum_B D_{i,B} / N_B$, in which N_B is the number of reference breeding institutes or stations; (b) specifications using the maximum similarity among all breeding institutes, where D_i is the similarity index with the most similar breeding institute, that is, $D_i = \max(D_{i,B})$; (c) specifications using the average similarity weighted by the number of developed varieties released, where $D_i = \sum_B V_B D_{i,B} / N_B$, with V_B being the total number of improved varieties released by breeding institute B (based on Takeshima and Nasir 2017, Table 1); and (d) specifications using all outstations of breeding institutes, which is similar to (a), except that D_i is the average of similarity with respect to all outstations.

Table 5.1 Determinants of adopting mechanical technologies, panel fixed effects, linear probability model (elasticities)

Measure of agroclimatic similarity	Designation	North West and North East (excl. Taraba State)		Northern Nigeria	
		Farm size	Ln (farm size)	Farm size	Ln (farm size)
Primary specifications (a)	D	0.159**	0.225**	0.075**	0.142**
	F	0.097*	0.139**	0.085*	0.132**
	$D \times F$	0.078*	0.087*	0.071*	0.090**
Robustness check (b) using the maximum similarity among all breeding institutes	F	0.044 [†]	0.099**	0.043 [†]	0.086**
	$D \times F$	0.027	0.047*	0.030 [†]	0.045**
Robustness check (c) using the average similarity weighted by the number of developed varieties released	F	0.093**	0.144**	0.055 [†]	0.113**
	$D \times F$	0.072*	0.091**	0.046	0.072**
Robustness check (d) using all outstations of breeding institutes	F	0.112*	0.164**	0.010	0.084*
	$D \times F$	0.092*	0.111**	0.002	0.044

Source: Author’s estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Note: Statistical significance: [†] 10 percent, * 5 percent, ** 1 percent. D = agroclimatic similarity; F = size of farm purchased outright or distributed by the village.

Furthermore, we also show the results with and without the natural log transformation of farm size, as well as with and without the North Central zone as part of the sample. In terms of agroclimatic conditions and farming systems, the North Central zone is more similar to the North West and North East zones than the southern zones are, but it still exhibits some differences.⁴ Full results of the primary specifications are presented in Table B.1 in the Appendix B. Figures in Table 5.1 are shown as elasticities. For example, 0.097 means that a 1-percent increase in farm size leads to a 0.097-percent higher probability of adopting mechanical technologies.

Note that the effects of agroclimatic similarity, which is time invariant, are estimated by regressing the predicted household fixed effects on all time-invariant variables that were dropped from the panel fixed-effect specifications. However, we show only the effect of agroclimatic similarity (without its interaction with farm size) for the primary specifications (the first row of Table 5.1) because the properties of the aforementioned methodology of regressing predicted fixed effects on time-invariant variables are not clearly established in the literature. Nevertheless, this methodology still provides some indications of the effects of these time-invariant variables, such as agroclimatic similarity, on the adoption rates of mechanical technologies.

Overall, the set of results in Table 5.1 suggests that, for a broad range of measures, both agroclimatic similarity and greater farm size, and importantly, their interactive effects, are consistently strong determinants that positively affect the adoption of mechanical technologies (animal traction, tractors, or both).

Importantly, the results in Table 5.1 do not mean that the agroclimatic similarity indexes are capturing the effects of other potentially correlated variables. For example, Tables 5.2 and 5.3 show the Spearman rank correlations between the agroclimatic similarity indexes and farm size, and between the agroclimatic similarity indexes and distance to the administrative center, respectively. Although one may argue that average farm size may be smaller in areas with high agroclimatic similarity (because higher productivity there may lead to higher population growth or in-migration from elsewhere), no strong correlations are found between these variables (indicated by correlation coefficients that are much smaller than 1 in Table 5.2). Similarly, though one may argue that agroclimatic similarity may be higher in areas closer to administrative

⁴ Based on the standard farming system classification by Dixon, Gulliver, and Gibbon (2001), the North West and North East zones of Nigeria straddle the pastoral system, the agropastoral millet/sorghum system, and the cereal-root crops mixed system, whereas the North Central zone mainly uses the cereal-root crops mixed system.

centers because research stations are sometimes located in such administrative centers, these correlations are quite weak (that is, the correlation coefficients in Table 5.3 are also much smaller than 1). Therefore, it is unlikely that the strong effects of agroclimatic similarity in Table 5.1 are wrongly capturing the effects of other variables that are strongly correlated with agroclimatic similarity.

Table 5.2 Limited correlations between agroclimatic similarity and average exogenous farm size (Spearman rank correlations)

Measure of agroclimatic similarity	Northern Nigeria	North West and North East zones (excluding Taraba State)
Primary specifications (a)	0.021	0.023
Robustness check (b) using the maximum similarity among all breeding institutes	0.065	0.053
Robustness check (c) using the average similarity weighted by the number of developed varieties released	0.033	0.041
Robustness check (d) using all outstations of breeding institutes	-0.022	0.018

Source: Author's estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Table 5.3 Limited correlations between agroclimatic similarity and distance to the nearest administrative center (Spearman rank correlations)

Measure of agroclimatic similarity	Northern Nigeria	North West and North East zones (excluding Taraba State)
Primary specifications (a)	0.203	0.121
Robustness check (b) using the maximum similarity among all breeding institutes	0.246	0.158
Robustness check (c) using the average similarity weighted by the number of developed varieties released	0.155	0.066
Robustness check (d) using all outstations of breeding institutes	0.036	-0.044

Source: Author's estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Other Key Determinants

The primary interests of this paper regarding the determinants of the adoption of mechanical technologies are agroclimatic similarity to the breeding institute and farm size, summarized in Table 5.1. The other key determinants, based on the full results shown in Table B.1, include the following. The probability of adopting a mechanical technology is higher for households with greater values of livestock owned, possibly because mechanical technology may be associated with owning more animals that can provide traction, and possibly because of

higher demand for intensification to produce feed crops. Higher rental costs generally discourage adoption, as expected. Higher chemical fertilizer prices also discourage adoption. Although chemical fertilizer may often be considered a substitute for mechanical technology, here a higher fertilizer price may discourage the adoption of mechanical technologies because cultivating a larger area with a mechanical technology also requires a greater amount of fertilizer. Adoption rates are also higher in areas more suitable for irrigation, which is proxied by a greater share of farmers in the EA who use irrigation. More capital-endowed farm households are also more likely to adopt mechanical technologies, possibly because agricultural equipment may complement draft animal use by facilitating various operations on farms initially plowed by draft animals or tractors, which tend to be larger, or by raising the productivity of the equipment when it is attached to animals or tractors (Jansen 1993). Higher rainfall in April is also found to induce more adoption of mechanical technologies, possibly because it may increase the vegetation in the soil, requiring more intensive plowing at the beginning of the production season. A steeper slope on one's farmland discourages the use of mechanical technologies, possibly because soil erosion from intensive plowing may be more severe. Greater household assets may encourage adoption of mechanical technologies by relieving the liquidity constraints on purchasing more inputs to farm more area more intensively using mechanical technologies. A greater share of educated working-age household members may encourage adoption of mechanical technologies, possibly due to higher opportunity costs for family labor. Female-headed households are less likely to adopt mechanical technologies, possibly due to various constraints they face in accessing modern inputs in general.

Attribution of Rising Returns to Scale to the Adoption of Mechanical Technologies

Table 5.4 shows the estimated effects of the adoption of mechanical technologies (animal traction, tractors, or both) on RTS, as measured through the effects on underlying production functions. Effects are shown for various measures of agroclimatic similarity for robustness-check purposes. All test specifications suggest that the input variables deemed endogenous are indeed so, and the specifications with included and excluded IVs satisfy necessary conditions for the consistency of the estimated parameters.

Table 5.4 Effects of adoption of mechanical technologies on production functions and returns on scale

Variable/category	Agroclimatic similarity index							
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)	
	Adopter s	Nonado pters	Adopter s	Nonado pters	Adopter s	Nonado pters	Adopter s	Nonado pters
Production function coefficients								
Land	0.649** (0.217)	0.019 (0.206)	0.599** (0.228)	0.177 (0.212)	0.657** (0.216)	0.004 (0.204)	0.642** (0.217)	-0.034 (0.206)
Labor	0.327 (0.265)	0.055 (0.121)	0.359 (0.282)	0.067 (0.107)	0.317 (0.265)	0.053 (0.125)	0.324 (0.265)	0.062 (0.121)
Livestock	0.000 (0.021)	0.025 (0.017)	0.008 (0.022)	0.018 (0.017)	0.001 (0.022)	0.025 (0.017)	0.001 (0.022)	0.026 (0.017)
Agricultural equipment	0.067 (0.043)	0.123** (0.043)	0.042 (0.047)	0.118** (0.044)	0.067 (0.043)	0.124** (0.043)	0.067 (0.043)	0.124** (0.043)
Other expenditures for purchased inputs	0.160** (0.051)	0.245** (0.062)	0.182** (0.059)	0.281** (0.066)	0.165** (0.051)	0.245** (0.062)	0.161** (0.051)	0.248** (0.062)
Agroclimatic similarity	0.150* (.072)	0.292** (0.067)	0.173* (0.071)	0.090 (0.061)	0.001** (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)	0.152* (0.074)	0.299** (0.067)
RTS	1.203** (0.271)	0.469* (0.191)	1.157** (0.268)	0.662 (0.184)	1.208** (0.271)	0.451* (0.189)	1.195** (0.272)	0.426* (0.190)
Z-value for the significance of the difference in RTS ($\widehat{\rho}_R$) ^a	2.214		1.523		2.291		2.318	
No. of observations	1,662	1,718	1,662	1,718	1,662	1,718	1,662	1,718
<i>p</i> -value								
H ₀ : Land, labor, and other expenditures jointly exogenous ^b	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
H ₀ : Model is not overidentified ^c	.317	.378	.394	.131	.332	.427	.328	.379
H ₀ : Model suffers from weak identification ^d	.002	.082	.002	.005	.003	.080	.002	.073
H ₀ : Variables are jointly insignificant	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Source: Authors' estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Note: Statistical significance: † 10 percent, * 5 percent, ** 1 percent. RTS = return to scale. Standard errors are adjusted for possible within-enumeration area correlations of idiosyncratic shocks. Standard errors reported do not account for the potential complications of multiple steps involved with the estimations, as described in the literature on the inverse probability-weighted generalized method of moments (IPW-GMM). ^a Statistical significance is based on the raw standard errors, which do not account for the potential complications of multiple steps involved in the estimations. The standard errors of inverse probability weighting, particularly of multiple-step estimation methods like ours (IPW-GMM), have not yet been developed in the literature (Imbens and Wooldridge 2009). ^b Endogeneity test is based on Hausman (1978). ^c Based on Hansen *J*-statistics. ^d Based on Kleibergen and Paap (2006).

The findings suggest that adoption of mechanical technologies (animal traction, tractors, or both) significantly raises the RTS in agricultural production at the farm household level. The estimated RTS ($\widehat{\rho}_R$) is generally in the range of 0.5 among the IPW sample of nonadopters, whereas it is on the order of 1.0 among the IPW sample of adopters. Although each RTS is not

necessarily representative of each type of farm household, the differences in $\widehat{\rho}_R$ between these two groups are internally consistent estimators.

The same interpretations apply to the estimated coefficients (output elasticities) of each input. Although their differences are less precisely estimated, results generally suggest that the increase in RTS from the adoption of mechanical technologies largely accrues to increased output elasticities of land (generally 0.6 among adopters as opposed to near 0 among nonadopters). These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that the positive interaction effects of agroclimatic similarity with farm size on adoption (Table 5.1) are partly driven by the RTS-raising effects shown in Table 5.4.

It is important to note that the estimated production functions and corresponding RTS hold only for the currently prevailing production scales in the samples (typical range of farm size, labor uses, use intensity of other purchased inputs, and agricultural capital intensity). The RTS can be different for other farm households that are not represented in the sample analyzed in this paper, or it could change as a significant segment of farm households evolves into production systems on different scales.

Other Key Determinants of Total Factor Productivity

Our primary interest is the RTS, and particularly the difference in RTS between adopters and nonadopters of mechanical technologies. As mentioned above, the results for adopters or nonadopters by themselves are not representative because the results are based on an IPW sample. However, we will briefly interpret the full results, shown in Table B.2. Coefficients of all variables other than inputs and production factors can be roughly interpreted as their effects on TFP.

Agroclimatic similarity to the nearest plant breeding station is positively associated with TFP, consistent with earlier descriptions. Greater soil bulk density may lower TFP, possibly because of reduced aeration and the general farm power requirements for plowing, such as the use of animal traction (Jaeger and Matlon 1990). Productivity is also higher in areas with historically higher and more stable rainfall, as expected. Greater rainfall in May seems negatively associated with TFP, possibly because it may increase the prevalence of pests during the main production season that follows. Greater wind is also negatively associated with TFP because it tends to cause higher evapotranspiration and reduced moisture and as well as

increased land degradation (World Bank 2007; Tittone and Giller 2013). A greater plot slope is positively associated with TFP, possibly reflecting the fact that farming systems often range from midslope with lighter soils to lowland with heavier soils, such that TFP at midslope may be originally high (Binswanger-Mkhize and Savastano 2017). Rugged terrain, on the other hand, is negatively associated with TFP, often raising the transaction costs for trade and for movement of inputs and other factors (Nunn and Puga 2012). A younger household head is also found to be associated with a higher TFP. Finally, a greater share of noneducated household members is also, surprisingly, positively associated with TFP, possibly because the lack of education may reflect these individuals' longer engagement and comparative familiarity with farming, compared with more educated household members, who may have been less engaged in farming.

5 Conclusions

There has been a knowledge gap regarding how agricultural mechanization in countries like Nigeria has both been induced by and affected agricultural productivity. In particular, despite the important role the public sector has historically played in raising overall productivity and improving technologies through R&D in plant breeding, little knowledge existed in Nigeria about how this role might have affected the adoption of mechanical technologies. Furthermore, despite the general agreement that agricultural mechanization is associated with a greater RTS in agriculture, little has been known about whether the former causes the latter, rather than the other way around, limiting our understanding of how RTS evolves during the agricultural transformation process.

This paper partly fills this knowledge gap, using farm household data from Nigeria as well as various spatial agroclimatic data. The results suggest that the adoption of key agricultural mechanization technologies in Nigeria (animal traction, tractors, or both) has been higher in areas with higher agroclimatic similarity with agricultural R&D stations, and this effect is heterogeneous, being particularly strong among relatively larger farms. Furthermore, these effects are likely to have been driven by the fact that the adoption of these mechanical technologies has been directly causing a rise in RTS in the underlying production function. Agricultural mechanization, represented here as the switch from manual labor to animal traction and tractors, has been not only raising the average RTS but also potentially magnifying the

effects of productivity-enhancing public-sector R&D on spatial variations in agricultural productivity in countries like Nigeria.

In Nigeria, both intensification-driven demand and scale effects–induced demand are jointly important determinants of the adoption of mechanical technologies. Even intermediate mechanization technologies such as animal traction have important scale effects, suggesting that the agricultural sector in Nigeria has undergone significant changes in the comparative advantages among farms with different scales.

Methodologically, the results show that agroclimatic similarity indicators, which have not yet been widely used in the literature, are important in understanding the potential demand for and adoption of mechanical technologies, as well as other inputs, in countries like Nigeria. This outcome suggests that not only the spatial variations in agroclimatic conditions but also the spatial variations in public-sector R&D activities are important factors in explaining the spatial variations in demand for mechanization in Nigeria.

The findings have important policy implications. First, they are consistent with the hypothesis that in Nigeria, overall agricultural production technologies, including varietal technologies that critically affect the returns on farm power use and are often generated through public-sector agricultural R&D, are still inferior and have been holding back further mechanization growth at the intensive margins, including the substitution of tractors for animal traction at a wider scale.

References

- ACET (African Center for Economic Transformation). 2014. *2014 African Transformation Report: Growth with Depth*. Accra, Ghana.
- Barker R, RW Herdt & B Rose. (1985). *The Rice Economy of Asia*. Washington DC.: Resources for the Future.
- Basu S. (2008). *Returns to Scale Measurement*. In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd ed. Edited by S Durlauf and L Blume, 5559-5562. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Bazzi S, A Gaduh, AD Rothenberg & M Wong. (2016). Skill Transferability, Migration, and Development: Evidence from Population Resettlement in Indonesia. *American Economic Review* 106 (9):2658-2698.
- Biggs S & S Justice. (2015). *Rural and Agricultural Mechanization: A History of the Spread of Small Engines in Selected Asian Countries*. Discussion Paper 01443. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Binswanger H. (1986). Agricultural Mechanization: A Comparative Historical Perspective. *World Bank Research Observer* 1(1):27-56.
- Binswanger-Mkhize HP & S Savastano. (2017). Agricultural Intensification: The Status in Six African Countries. *Food Policy* 67:26-40.
- Cramb RA. (2011). Re-Inventing Dualism: Policy Narratives and Modes of Oil Palm Expansion in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Journal of Development Studies* 47(2):274-293.
- Deininger K & D Byerlee. (2012). The Rise of Large Farms in Land Abundant Countries: Do They Have a Future? *World Development* 40(4):701-714.
- Diao X, F Cossar, N Houssou & S Kolavalli. (2014). Mechanization in Ghana: Emerging Demand, and the Search for Alternative Supply Models. *Food Policy* 48:168-181.
- Diao X, J Silver & H Takeshima. (2016). *Agricultural Mechanization and Agricultural Transformation*. Discussion Paper 01527. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Dixon J, A Gulliver & D Gibbon. (2001). *Farming Systems and Poverty: Improving Farmers' Livelihoods in a Changing World*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Economic Planning Agency (Government of Japan). 1962. *Keizai Bunseki (Analyses of economies)*. Economic Planning Agency, Government of Japan.
- Ehui S & R Polson. (1993). A Review of the Economic and Ecological Constraints on Animal Draft Cultivation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Soil and Tillage Research* 27(1-4):195-210.
- Evenson RE. (1988). *Research, Extension, and U.S. Agricultural Productivity: A Statistical Decomposition Analysis*. In *Agricultural Productivity: Measurement and Explanation*, SM Capalbo & JM Antle (eds.), 289-315. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Evenson R & D Gollin. (2003). *Crop Variety Improvement and Its Effect on Productivity: The Impact of International Agricultural Research*. Wallingford, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International.
- Gyimah-Brempong K, M Johnson & H Takeshima. (2016). *The Nigerian Rice Economy: Policy Options for Transforming Production, Marketing, and Trade*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hausman J. (1978). Specification Tests in Econometrics. *Econometrica* 46:1251-1271.
- Hayami Y & T Kawagoe. (1989). Farm Mechanization, Scale Economies and Polarization: The Japanese Experience. *Journal of Development Economics* 31(2):221-239.

- Imbens G & J Woolridge. (2009). Recent Developments in the Econometrics of Program Evaluation. *Journal of Economic Literature* 47(1):5-86.
- Jaeger W & P Matlon. (1990). Utilization, Profitability, and the Adoption of Animal Draft Power in West Africa. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73(1):35-48.
- Jansen H. (1993). Ex-Ante Profitability of Animal Traction Investments in Semi-Arid Sub-Saharan Africa: Evidence from Niger and Nigeria. *Agricultural Systems* 43:323-349.
- Kislev Y & W Peterson. (1996). *Economies of Scale in Agriculture: A Reexamination of the Evidence*. In *The Economics of Agriculture. Vol. 2, Papers in Honor of D. Gale Johnson*, J Antle & DA Sumner (eds.), 156-170. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kleibergen F & R Paap. (2006). Generalized Reduced Rank Tests Using the Singular Value Decomposition. *Journal of Econometrics* 133(1):97-126.
- Lawrence PR & RA Pearson. (2002). Use of Draught Animal Power on Small Mixed Farms in Asia. *Agricultural Systems* 71(1):99-110.
- LSMS (Living Standards Measurement Study). Various years. Nigeria datasets. Accessed January 15, 2012, 2014, 2017.
- Nunn N & D Puga. (2012). Ruggedness: The Blessing of Bad Geography in Africa. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94(1):20-36.
- Olmstead AL & PW Rhode. (2001). Reshaping the landscape: the impact and diffusion of the tractor in American agriculture, 1910–1960. *Journal of Economic History* 61(03):663-698.
- Robins J & A Rotnitzky. (1995). Semiparametric Efficiency in Multivariate Regression Models with Missing Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90(429):122-129.
- . 2017. “Custom-Hired Tractor Services and Returns to Scale in Smallholder Agriculture: A Production Function Approach.” *Agricultural Economics* 48 (3): 363–372.
- . 2017b. *The Roles of Agroclimatic Similarity and Returns on Scale in the Demand for Mechanization: Insights from Northern Nigeria*. Discussion Paper 01692. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Takeshima, H., N. Houssou, and X. Diao. 2017. *Effects of Tractor Ownership on Agricultural Returns-to-Scale in Household Maize Production: Evidence from Ghana*. Discussion Paper 01671. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Takeshima, H., and A. Nasir. 2017. *The Role of the Locations of Public Sector Varietal Development Activities on Agricultural Productivity: Evidence from Northern Nigeria*. Nigeria Strategy Support Program Working Paper 42. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Takeshima, H., A. Nin-Pratt, and X. Diao. 2013. “Mechanization and Agricultural Technology Evolution, Agricultural Intensification in Sub-Saharan Africa: Typology of Agricultural Mechanization in Nigeria.” *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95 (5): 1230–1236.
- Tittonell P & KE Giller. (2013). When Yield Gaps Are Poverty Traps: The Paradigm of Ecological Intensification in African Smallholder Agriculture. *Field Crops Research* 143:76-90.
- Walker TS & J Alwang. (2015). *Crop Improvement, Adoption and Impact of Improved Varieties in Food Crops in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Wallingford, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International.
- Wan G & E Cheung. (2001). Effects of Land Fragmentation and Returns to Scale in Chinese Farming Sector. *Applied Economics* 33:183-194.
- World Bank. 2007. *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Washington, DC.

Appendix A: Agroclimatic Similarity

“Agroclimatic similarity” is constructed as a measure of the similarity between the area where each household is located and the area where the nearest plant breeding institution or substation is located, in terms of the soil, hydrological, and climate conditions described above. As in Takeshima and Nasir (2017), it is calculated by applying a formula used in the literature (for example, Bazzi et al. 2016), where a single indicator is constructed as a weighted sum of the similarity measures for each of the soil, hydrological, and climate factors. Detailed set of factors are discussed in Takeshima (2017b, section 4).

A raw similarity index for household i with respect to the breeding institute B ($D_{i,B}$) is

$$D_{i,B} = -\sum_{\theta} w_{\theta} (|A_i^{\theta} - A_B^{\theta}|), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where A_i^{θ} and A_B^{θ} are the values of key agroclimatic parameters θ in the areas where farm household i and breeding institute B , respectively, are located. $|A_i^{\theta} - A_B^{\theta}|$ is the absolute deviation. The weight for each θ (w_{θ}) captures the effect of the similarity of θ on the overall similarity. Sample average values of θ are used as w_{θ} , so that absolute deviations are standardized relative to the unit of θ . With the negative “ $-$ ” added in front of the summation operator in (A1), an increase in $D_{i,B}$ indicates an increase in agroclimatic similarity.

The overall similarity index for household i (D_i), then, is

$$D_i = f(D_{i,B}), \quad (\text{A2})$$

in which f denotes various functions that translate $D_{i,B}$ to D_i . We primarily present the case in which f is the average, so that $D_i = \sum_B D_{i,B} / N_B$, where N_B is the number of reference breeding institutes or stations. We then present the robustness of the results using different f 's, such as the maximum and the average weighted by the number of improved varieties released (more details are provided in Section 4).

Appendix B: Full results

Table B.1 Determinants of the adoption of mechanical technologies (animal traction, tractors, or both), linear probability model, primary specifications

Variable	North West and North East zones, excluding Taraba State	Northern Nigeria
Agroclimatic similarity to location of research station (σ)	0.225** (0.035)	0.142** (0.026)
Farm area purchased outright or distributed by chief (F)	0.139** (0.039)	0.132** (0.030)
$\sigma \times F$	0.087* (0.035)	0.090** (0.027)
ln (real local price of beef)	0.101 (0.162)	-0.041 (0.127)
ln (real local price of milk)	0.009 (0.015)	0.013 (0.012)
Pasture area per head of livestock (index)	-0.006 (0.008)	0.001 (0.008)
ln (real value of livestock owned)	0.135** (0.020)	0.112** (0.018)
ln (animal traction rental cost per day)	-0.086 (0.064)	-0.246** (0.066)
ln (number of male adult household members \geq 20 years old)	-0.007 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.004)
ln (number of female adult household members \geq 20 years old)	0.000 (0.005)	0.004 (0.005)
ln (number of child household members)	0.009 (0.020)	0.013 (0.014)
Age of household head	0.129 (0.116)	0.063 (0.121)
Distance to market (minutes of travel time)	-0.833 (1.159)	0.520 (0.486)
Distance to administrative center (minutes of travel time)	-0.141 (0.130)	-0.268 (0.177)
ln (real price of chemical fertilizer)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001* (0.000)
ln (real daily farm wage for an adult male worker)	0.389 (0.403)	0.260 (0.226)
EA sample share of farmers using irrigation	0.026** (0.008)	0.021** (0.007)
ln (real value of agricultural equipment owned)	0.098** (0.018)	0.067** (0.018)
Rainfall in April (mm)	0.029* (0.014)	0.007 (0.021)
Rainfall in May (mm)	0.022 (0.029)	0.005 (0.025)
Slope (%)	-0.055 (0.061)	-0.126 [†] (0.071)
ln (real value of household assets)	0.026 [†] (0.015)	0.035* (0.014)
Share of noneducated working-age household members	-0.087** (0.024)	-0.087** (0.023)
Gender of household head (= 1 if female)	-0.481* (0.214)	-0.180 (0.168)
Wave 2 dummy	-0.025 (0.016)	-0.047** (0.015)
Wave 3 dummy	0.008 (0.025)	-0.021 (0.025)
Intercept	Included	Included
No. of observations	5,031	5,031
p -value (H_0 : Variables are jointly insignificant)	.000	.000

Source: Author's estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Note: Statistical significance: [†] 10 percent, * 5 percent, ** 1 percent. EA = enumeration area. As mentioned in the main text, coefficients for agroclimatic similarity are obtained by regressing the predicted fixed effects on time-invariant variables (including an agroclimatic similarity index).

Table B.2 Effects of the adoption of mechanical technologies on the production function and returns on scale

Variable	Adopters		Nonadopters	
Production function coefficients				
ln (Labor use) (person-day per year)	0.649**	(0.217)	0.019	(0.206)
ln (Land) (square meters)	0.327	(0.265)	0.055	(0.121)
ln (Livestock value)	0.000	(0.021)	0.025	(0.017)
ln (Agricultural equipment value)	0.067	(0.043)	0.123**	(0.043)
ln (Other expenditures for purchased inputs)	0.160**	(0.051)	0.245**	(0.062)
Agroclimatic similarity (σ)	0.150*	(0.072)	0.292**	(0.067)
Soil bulk density (MT/m ³)	-0.551*	(0.265)	-0.579*	(0.295)
Soil silt component (%)	0.007	(0.085)	0.024	(0.083)
Soil sand component (%)	-0.093	(0.228)	-0.206	(0.191)
Soil acidity (pH)	-0.092	(0.210)	0.004	(0.165)
Soil organic contents (g/kg of soil)	0.036	(0.061)	-0.033	(0.054)
Euclidean distance to ARS (geographic minutes)	-0.013	(0.038)	-0.021	(0.034)
Euclidean distance to nearest river (geographic minutes)	0.020	(0.013)	-0.013	(0.014)
Euclidean distance to dam (geographic minutes)	-0.003	(0.016)	0.022	(0.016)
Rainfall (historical average, long term, mm)	0.214*	(0.098)	0.074	(0.088)
Rainfall (historical standard deviation, mm)	-0.183*	(0.087)	-0.054	(0.067)
Rainfall in April (mm)	-0.004	(0.011)	-0.015	(0.010)
Rainfall in May (mm)	-0.043*	(0.021)	-0.043**	(0.012)
Wind (10-meter height, annual average, m/s)	0.159	(0.143)	-0.220*	(0.103)
Solar radiation (kWh/m ² , annual average)	0.771	(0.619)	0.134	(0.543)
Slope (%)	0.035**	(0.010)	0.041**	(0.009)
Terrain ruggedness (index)	-0.024**	(0.009)	0.005	(0.009)
Age of household head	-0.084*	(0.033)	0.013	(0.030)
Share of noneducated household members	0.023*	(0.011)	0.037**	(0.011)
Wave 2 dummy	0.015 [†]	(0.009)	-0.015	(0.010)
Wave 3 dummy	0.005	(0.012)	-0.021*	(0.010)
Intercept	Included		Included	
No. of observations	1,662		1,718	
<i>p</i> -values				
H ₀ : Land, labor, and other expenditures jointly exogenous ^b	.000		.000	
H ₀ : Model is not overidentified ^c	.317		.378	
H ₀ : Model suffers from weak identification ^d	.002		.082	
H ₀ : Variables are jointly insignificant	.000		.000	

Source: Authors' estimations based on LSMS (various years).

Note: Statistical significance: [†] 10 percent, * 5 percent, ** 1 percent. ARS = agricultural research station. Standard errors are adjusted for possible within-enumeration area correlations of idiosyncratic shocks. Standard errors reported do not account for the potential complications of multiple steps involved in the estimations, as in the literature on the inverse probability weighting-based generalized method of moments. ^a Statistical significance is based on the raw standard errors, which do not account for the potential complications of multiple steps involved in the estimations. ^b Endogeneity test is based on Hausman (1978). ^c Based on Hansen's *J*-statistic. ^d Based on the Kleibergen-Paap *rk* Lagrange multiplier test.