

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.

Off-Farm Labor Supply Effects of Farm Mechanization

Mansur Ahmed and Barry Goodwin

Department of Economics North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695 Email:mahmed3@ncsu.edu

Selected Poster prepared for presentation at the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association's Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, July 27-29, 2014.

Copyright 2014 by Mansur Ahmed and Barry Goodwin. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Off-Farm Labor Supply Effects of Farm Mechanization

Mansur Ahmed and Barry Goodwin

Economics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695

1. Motivation

- •Movement of surplus labor from agriculture to the nonfarm sector is considered as an important feature of economic development.
- •Due to rise of non-farm employment opportunities in rural area, farm operators may relocate their labor hours between farm and non-farm uses.
- •The use of labor-saving technology such as tractors, threshers, husking machines etc., has created scope for releasing labor time for higher productive off-farm works.
- •Much focus has been on modeling and examining the offfarm labor supply effects of farming efficiency, and farm income; off-farm labor supply effects of agricultural mechanization remain unexplored.

2. Objective

The main objective of the paper is to examine the impact of farm mechanization on off-farm labor supply decision of farm operators?

3. Conceptual Framework

- An agricultural household model (Singh et al., 1986; Sadoulet and deJanvry, 1995) is used to establish the relationship between farm mechanization and off-farm labor supply.
- We introduce mechanization into production technology in agricultural household model.
- Farm Household Maximizes Utility Function:

$$U = U(q, l; z)$$

• Subject to:

 Income Constraint: $p_c q + rX(T) = p_f Q + wM$

• Technology Constraint:

 $Q = Q\{X(T), F(T), D\}$

• Time Constraint:

T = M + F(T) + l

(Here q is quantity consumed, Q is quantity produced, 1 is leisure, z is other household characteristics, X is vector of inputs, T is mechanization level used in production process, F is farm labor hour; and M is off-farm labor hours.)

 Solution of the above Household's model lead to the following generic derived supply of off-farm labor:

$$M^*=M(r, w, p, p_f, T, D, z)$$

• We have estimated a simplified reduced form model of labor supply.

4. Models and Data

➤ Econometric Model for Participation Status & Level of Off-Farm Labor Supply

$$Y_i^* = T\alpha + X_i\beta + \epsilon_i$$
 Where $Y_i = 1$, if $Y_i^* \ge 0$ and $Y_i = 0$, if $Y_i^* < 0$

- > We use adoption of tractor by a farm household as proxy variable for mechanization. Thus T stands for tractor use dummy and X stands for other observable household characteristics.
- The corner solution implied in the off-farm labor supply decision raises the issue of censoring or selection issues. The censoring is recognized through the adoption of the Tobit model.
- To test Off-farm labor supply effects of farm mechanization, we use Household survey data from Bangladesh.

5. Results

	Probit Estimates	Probit: Margin	nal Tobit Estimates
		Effects	
Tractor Use (Yes=1) (d)	0.0898**	0.0349**	206.3***
	(0.0466)	(0.018)	(92.4)
Log (Distance from Dhaka (km))	-0.054*	-0.021*	-100.14*
	(0.033)	(0.0128)	(60.93)
Non- Crop Cultivation (Yes=1) (d)	-0.093	-0.036	-119.93
	(0.0897)	(0.034)	(170.17)
Age of Household Head	0.00045	0.000175	5.19
	(0.0089)	(0.0035)	(18.11)
Squared Age	-0.00002	-0.00007	-0.764
	(0.000087)	(0.00003)	(0.177)
Completed 8th Grade (Yes=1) (d)	-0.0014	-0.00054	21.93
	(0.053)	(0.0205)	(106.2)
Receiving Foreign Remittance (Yes=1) (d)	0.2196***	0.0834***	427***
	(0.088)	(0.03235)	(161.2)
Log (Amount of Operating Land)	0.0016	0.0006	-1.925
	(0.0217)	(0.0085)	(43.85)
Other Member working Off-farm (Yes=1)	-0.0609	-0.0238	-128.82
	(0.0478)	(0.0187)	(96.71)
Number Children under 15 Yrs	-0.0184	-0.0072	-66.75*
	(0.0182)	(0.007)	(36.81)
Constant			1490.7***
			(571.93)
Smith-Blundell test of exogeneity of Tractor: Cl	hi-sqr(1)= 0.2365		F(1,3293)= 0.160
/sigma			2378***
Obcomunions	2204	2204	(33.95)
Observations	3304	3304	3304

5. Results

- Adoption of tractor, the proxy variable for farm mechanization, raise the probability of participation of farm operators in off-farm works by 3.5 percent.
- Similar to the participation decision, farm operators who adopt tractor in farming work on average 206 hours more in off-farm employment compared to the farm operators who do not adopt tractor in farming.
- The Smith-Blundell tests for exogeneity of tractor fail to reject the null hypothesis of exogeneity of tractor use for both Probit and Tobit models.
- Farm operators who live far from the capital are less likely to participate in the off-farm works as density of non-farm activities declines with the distance from the capital.
- Foreign remittance recipient farm operators are 8.3 percent more likely to participate in non-farm works as foreign remittance may ease the credit constraint for starting new businesses.
- Education does not have a significant effect on the offfarm labor supply of farm operators. This result consistent with earlier literature (Sumner, 1982; and Mishra & Goodwin, 1997).

6. Conclusion and Policy Implications

- The results confirm that tractor use in cultivation could raise both the probability of participation in off-farm works and the amount of hours worked in the off-farm employment.
- As off-farm works are generally more remunerative, welfare of farm households could be raised through rapid agricultural mechanization.
- Developing economies with high growth in nonagriculture could promote mechanization through subsidized mechanized farm equipments to release surplus farm-labor.

Contact: mahmed3@ncsu.edu