Efficiency of Egyptian Organic Agriculture: a Local Maximum Likelihood Approach

Bouali Guesmi*[1], Teresa Serra[2], Amr Radwan[2,3] and José María Gil[2]

[1] Ecole Supérieure d'Agriculture de Mograne - 1121 Zaghouan , Tunisie
Tél.: (+216) 72 660 283; Fax : (+216) 72 660 563.

[2] Centre de Recerca en Economia i Desenvolupament Agroalimentari (CREDA-UPC-IRTA).
Parc Mediterrani de la Tecnologia, Edifici ESAB, Avinguda del Canal Olímplic s/n, 08860
Castelldefels, SPAIN. Tel.: +34935521208; Fax: +34935521121.

[3] Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, Cairo,
Egypt.

Paper prepared for presentation at the EAAE 2014 Congress
'Agri-Food and Rural Innovations for Healthier Societies'

August 26 to 29, 2014
Ljubljana, Slovenia

1. Introduction

Although with a declining trend, Egyptian agriculture still accounts for about 17 per cent of gross domestic product and 20 per cent of total exports and foreign-exchange revenues. In addition, agriculture-related industries, such as processing, marketing and input supplies, account for another 20 per cent of gross domestic product. Agriculture is therefore a key sector in the Egyptian economy, providing the livelihood for 55 per cent of the population (UNDP, 2011). A very important pillar for the modernization of the Egyptian agriculture involves promoting exports of high value added products such as organic produce.

While expansion of organic farming had been quite slow until 1988, it experienced a rapid growth in the vegetables, fruits, cereals, and cotton sectors thereafter. This rapid growth was initiated mainly by SEKEM and some other growers in Fayum and Kalubia governorates. Currently, organic agriculture in Egypt is expanding very fast due to public awareness of the advantages associated to this farming practice, as well as the increasing demands for organic food and fibers in both local and export markets. As a result, organic farming has rapidly grown from 15 thousand hectares farmed by 460 organic farms in 2006 to 56 thousand hectares managed by 909 producers in 2009 (FiBL and IFOAM, 2011). Almost half of the Egyptian organic farms are located in the middle Nile, in the region of El Fayoum, 100 Km south of Cairo. Organic farms in Egypt are generally small holdings whose size usually ranges from 4.5 to 20 hectares. A few farm enterprises are larger than 1000 Feddan (400 hectares), but they account for 20% of all organic farmland and are located in the Nile delta and in Upper Egypt (Kledal et al., 2008).

Organic farming mainly relies on the use of less chemical inputs than conventional agriculture. Because this restricted input use, organic practices are likely to be less productive than conventional agriculture. This lower productivity however does not necessarily affect farms' profits once their product is certified organic, due to the high market price for organic produce. During the early stages of conversion, however, farms may face economic hardships for not being yet able to receive the organic produce price premium.

Technical efficiency (TE) is a prerequisite for economic efficiency, which in turn is a necessary condition for the economic viability and sustainability of a firm (Tzouvelekas et al., 2001). Knowledge about productivity and efficiency differences between conventional and organic farms is a relevant tool for economic agents considering alternatives to improve the performance of organic agriculture, and designing suitable policies to support the expansion of organic agriculture within Egypt. Using robust methodologies for TE analysis is important to derive unbiased efficiency estimates that allow monitoring the impacts of policy and better targeting policy measures. Despite the relevant growth of organic agriculture in Egypt, up to date there is no study that assesses the performance of organic farms in this country. Unlike previous mainstream literature on organic farming TE, which has widely relied on either the Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) or the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) to derive TE estimates, we use a new methodology recently introduced by Kumbakhar et al. (2007) based on local maximum likelihood techniques. In order to achieve the aforementioned objective, a survey was conducted for a sample of organic and conventional farms mainly specialized in horticulture and cereal production and located in the Upper Egypt area. More specifically, the survey was conducted in Suhag, Assiut and Fayum governorates.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, a literature review and the contribution of this work to previous literature is presented. Then, we describe the methodology used in our empirical application. The fourth section presents the data and results of the empirical implementation. Finally, the paper ends with some concluding remarks.

2. Literature review

While analyses on the adoption of organic farming practices have proliferated (Fairweather, 1999; Lohr and Salomonson, 2000; Pietola and Oude Lansink, 2001; Acs et al., 2007, Padel, 2001; Parra et al., 2007; Radwan et al., 2011), the literature on TE performance of organic farming is still small, which may be due to the scarcity of organic farming data necessary to conduct such analyses (Oude Lansink et al., 2002). Parametric SFA and non-parametric DEA methods constitute the mainstream of the efficiency literature assessing the differences in TE between conventional and organic farms. Results are not conclusive and differ across sectors, regions and methodologies.

Oude Lansink et al. (2002) used DEA techniques to compare organic and conventional crop and livestock farms in Finland. They found that organic farms are more technically efficient than conventional farms (0.96 *vs.* 0.72), though they tend to be less productive. Different results were achieved by another DEA-based study by Bayramoglu and Gundogmus (2008), who found that conventional raisin-producing farms in Turkey are more efficient than organic producers (0.90 *vs.* 0.86). Tzouvelekas et al. (2001; 2002a, b) used the SFA approach to assess the TE performance of Greek organic and conventional farms. They suggested that organic farmers are operating closer to their frontier than their conventional counterparts. In contrast, Madau (2007) applied a SFA model and found that Italian conventional cereal farms tend to be more efficient than organic farms (0.90 *vs.* 0.83). In another SFA-based study, Guesmi el al. (2012) suggested that the Catalan organic grape producers are more efficient than conventional growers (0.80 *vs.* 0.64, respectively).

Although both SFA and DEA methods entail several methodological advantages, they are also criticized for their shortcomings that may conduct to biased efficiency estimates. The main difference between these two approaches is that the SFA accounts for the stochastic component of production and measurement errors and that these are separated from the inefficiency effects. In contrast, DEA methods do not allow disentangling inefficiency from stochastic effects (Sharma et al., 1999; Wadud and White, 2000). Further, SFA permits conducting conventional statistical tests of hypotheses. SFA, however, relies on restrictive assumptions regarding the functional form representing the production frontier, as well as the distributional assumption for the random noise and inefficiency error components. DEA, in contrast does not require specification of any functional form. TE estimates have been shown to be sensitive to estimation techniques and functional form specifications (Ferrier and Lovell, 1990; Coelli and Perelman, 1999; Ruggiero and Vitaliano, 1999; Chakraborty et al., 2001). Both functional form and error distribution misspecifications, as well as ignoring stochastic component of production can lead to inaccurate efficiency estimates (Kumbhakar et al., 2007; Martins-Filho and Yao 2007; Serra and Goodwin, 2009).

To overcome the shortcomings of both methods without foregoing their advantages, Kumbhakar et al. (2007) recently developed a new methodological approach based on local modeling techniques. This model allows the parameters representing both production and error distribution to be localized with respect to the covariates. Hence, in contrast to standard SFA models, parameters representing production characteristics are allowed to change from firm to firm according to each firm particularities. In addition, as opposed to nonparametric techniques, this approach allows for stochastic variables and variable measurement errors when deriving TE scores. Furthermore, an important feature of this method is that it addresses heteroscedasticity by estimating observation-specific variances of the inefficiency and noise components of the error term (Serra and Goodwin, 2009). The local modeling approach proposed by Kumbhakar et al. (2007) relies upon LML principles (Fan and Gijbels, 1996).

In spite of the relevant features of LML techniques, there are few empirical studies in the literature (Kumbhakar et al., 2007; Martins-Filho and Yao 2007; Serra and Goodwin, 2009) relying on these methods. Only Serra and Goodwin (2009) have used LML to compare the efficiency performance of organic and conventional arable crop farming in Spain. Our work contributes to the efficiency literature as it constitutes the first study that compares TE levels for organic and conventional farms in Egypt. Productivity differences between the two farm types are also studied by determining the output elasticity of different inputs used in the production process.

3. Methodology

TE studies can constitute a useful tool to improve a firm's economic performance. For such purpose, it is necessary to choose a robust method that produces unbiased efficiency estimates. In this regard, LML approach has been chosen to consistently estimate TE. As noted above, LML methods overcome the most relevant limitations that have been attributed to DEA and SFA methods, without undergoing their advantages. LML techniques are used to compare the TE with which Egyptian organic and conventional farms operate.

Aigner et al. (1977) and Meeusen and Van den Broeck (1977) specified the general stochastic frontier model as follows $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta^T X_i - u_i + v_i$, where Y_i represents the observed output level produced by firm $i = 1, ..., N$, $X_i \in \Box^d$ is a vector of input quantities used in the production process, the betas are unknown parameters to be estimated, $u_i > 0$ is a non-negative inefficiency term and v_i is a random noise term. The parametric estimation of stochastic frontier models is usually based on maximum likelihood techniques. The joint pdf of (Y, X) is decomposed into a marginal pdf for X, $pdf(x) = p(x)$ and a conditional pdf for Y given x, $pdf(y|x) = g(y, \theta(x))$, where $\theta(x) \in \Box^k$ is the vector of parameters to be estimated.

Based on the parametric model developed by Aigner et al. (1977), the conditional pdf for Y given $X = x$ can be defined as: $Y = r(X) - u + v$, where $r(x)$ is the production frontier, $u | X = x \Box |N(0, \sigma_u^2(x))|$, $v | X = x \Box N(0, \sigma_v^2(x))$, and u and v are assumed to be independently distributed, conditional on X. Following Kumbhakar et al.' (2007) approach, the 3-dimensional local parameter vector is defined as $\theta(x) = (r(x), \sigma_u^2(x), \sigma_v^2(x))^T$ and is derived using local polynomials. The conditional log-likelihood function $L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log g(Y_i, \theta(X_i))$ is locally approximated by the following mth order local polynomial function:

$$L_N(\theta_0, \theta_1, ..., \theta_m) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} q\left(Y_i, \theta_0 + \theta_1(X_i - x) + ... + \theta_m(X_i - x)^m\right) K_H(X_i - x), \tag{1}$$

where x represents a fixed interior point in the support of $p(x)$, $q = \log g$, $\theta_j = (\theta_{j1}, ..., \theta_{jk})^T$ for $j = 0, 1, ..., m$, and $K_H(u) = |H|^{-1} K(H^{-1} u)$, where K represents a multivariate kernel function and H is assumed to be a positive definite and symmetric bandwidth matrix. The local polynomial estimator is determined by $\hat{\theta}(x) = \hat{\theta}_0(x)$ where

$$\left(\hat{\theta}_0(x), ..., \hat{\theta}_m(x)\right) = \arg \max_{\theta_0, ..., \theta_m} L_N(\theta_0, \theta_1, ..., \theta_m). \tag{2}$$

4

To empirically derive the LML estimator, Kumbhakar et al. (2007) propose using a local linear technique. The random noise and inefficiency terms are assumed to be distributed following a local normal and a half normal distribution, respectively, and the conditional probability density function of $\varepsilon = v - u$ is expressed as:

$$f\left(\varepsilon \mid X = x\right) = \frac{2}{\sigma(x)} \varphi\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma(x)}\right) \Phi\left(-\varepsilon \frac{\lambda(x)}{\sigma(x)}\right) \tag{3}$$

where $\sigma^2(x) = \sigma_u^2(x) + \sigma_v^2(x)$, $\lambda(x) = \sigma_u(x)/\sigma_v(x)$ and $\varphi(.)$ and $\Phi(.)$ represent the probability and the cumulative distribution functions of a standard normal variable, respectively. The local linear parameter is given by $\theta(x) = \left(r(x), \sigma^2(x), \lambda(x)\right)^T$ and the conditional pdf of Y given X is specified as:

$$g\left(y; \theta(x)\right) = \frac{2}{\sigma(x)} \varphi\left(\frac{y - r(x)}{\sigma(x)}\right) \Phi\left(-\left(y - r(x)\right) \frac{\lambda(x)}{\sigma(x)}\right) \tag{4}$$

The conditional local log-likelihood function is defined as:

$$L(\theta) \propto \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\frac{1}{2} \log \sigma^2(X_i) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(Y_i - r(X_i)\right)^2}{\sigma^2(X_i)} + \log \Phi\left(-\left(Y_i - r(X_i)\right) \frac{\lambda(X_i)}{\sqrt{\sigma^2(X_i)}}\right) \tag{5}$$

In the present study, we use a local linear model for the frontier $r(x_i)$ and a local constant model for the parameters of the error term. As a result, expression (5) is rewritten as:

$$L_N\left(\theta_0, \Theta_1\right) \propto \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\frac{1}{2} \log \sigma_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(Y_i - r_0 - r_1^T(X_i - x)\right)^2}{\sigma_0^2} + \log \Phi\left(-\left(Y_i - r_0 - r_1^T(X_i - x)\right) \frac{\lambda_0}{\sqrt{\sigma_0^2}}\right) K_H(X_i - x) \tag{6}$$

where $\theta_0 = \left(r_0, \sigma_0^2, \lambda_0\right)^T$ and $\Theta_1 = r_1^T$. The local linear estimator of the model is given by $\hat{\theta}_0$:

$$\left(\hat{\theta}_0(x), ..., \hat{\Theta}_1(x)\right) = \arg \max_{\theta_0, \Theta_1} L_N\left(\theta_0, \Theta_1\right) \tag{7}$$

Jondrow et al. (1982) proposed to obtain the efficiency measure for a particular sample observation as follows:

$$\hat{u}_i = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_0(X_i) \hat{\lambda}_0(X_i)}{1 + \hat{\lambda}_0^2(X_i)} \left[\frac{\varphi\left(-\hat{\varepsilon}(X_i) \hat{\lambda}_0(X_i)/\hat{\sigma}_0(X_i)\right)}{\Phi\left(-\hat{\varepsilon}(X_i) \hat{\lambda}_0(X_i)/\hat{\sigma}_0(X_i)\right)} - \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}(X_i) \hat{\lambda}_0(X_i)}{\hat{\sigma}_0(X_i)} \right], \tag{8}$$

where $\hat{\varepsilon}(X_i) = Y_i - \hat{r}_0(X_i)$. When variables are measured in logs, the efficiency level is given by $\hat{eff}_i = \exp(-\hat{u}_i) \in [0,1]$. The maximization problem in (7) is resolved by specifying starting values following Kumbhakar et al. (2007). We start with the local linear least squares estimator of $\hat{r}_0(x)$ and $\hat{r}_1(x)$ and the global ML estimators of $\hat{\sigma}^2$ and λ. By using the parametric Modified Ordinary Least Squares (MOLS) estimator, the local intercept $\hat{r}_0(x)$ is corrected. For this purpose we follow Kumbhakar et al. (2007) and we use the following

specification $\hat{r}_0^{MOLS}(x) = \hat{r}_0(x) + \sqrt{2\hat{\sigma}_u^2/\pi}$, where $\hat{\sigma}_u^2 = \hat{\sigma}^2\hat{\lambda}^2 / (1+\hat{\lambda}^2)$. Hence, starting values for solving (7) are derived from $\theta_0 = \left(\hat{r}_0^{MOLS}, \hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\lambda}\right)^T$ and $\Theta_1 = \hat{r}_1(x)^T$.

Regarding the multivariate kernel, we choose the following expression $h^{-d}\prod_{j=1}^{d} = K\left(h^{-1}(x_j)\right)$, where $K(.)$ is the Epanechnikov Kernel and d represents the number of covariates. The bandwidth is defined as: $h = h_{base} s_x N^{-1/5}$, where s_x represents the vector of empirical standard deviations of the covariates and N represents the number of observations. The cross validation criterion (CV) proposed by Kumbhakar et al. (2007) is used to obtain the optimal value for h_{base}. The CV, for a given value of h_{base}, is defined by minimizing the following expression:

$$CV\left(h_{base}\right) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\left(Y_i - \left(\hat{r}_0^{(i)}(x) - u_i^{(i)}\right)\right)\right]^2, \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{r}_0^{(i)}$ and $u_i^{(i)}$ are the leave-one-out versions of the local linear estimators defined above.

4. Empirical application and results

The empirical analysis uses cross sectional, farm-level data collected from a survey designed and conducted in Upper Egypt, specifically in Suhag, El Fayum and Assiut Governorates during the year 2010. These three governorates concentrate almost half of the organic area in Egypt (Kledal et al., 2008). Data were collected by face-to-face questionnaires during the period from March to June 2010 in these three governorates. The identification of the main organic production areas was based on a list of certified organic farmers obtained from COAE. Our sample consists of 30 organic farmers and 30 neighboring conventional farms mainly specialized in cereal and horticulture production. The neighboring criteria allowed obtaining a relatively analogous composition of the two subsamples of organic and conventional farms (Tzouvelekas et al., 2001; Madau, 2007).The reduced number of observations makes it advisable to pool organic and conventional data for the empirical application. The resulting heterogeneity of the sample makes it specially useful to use LML techniques.

For the purpose of our efficiency analysis, we define the following variables. Farm output (y_i) is expressed in currency units, Egyptian Pounds (equivalent to 1/8 €), and represents total farm income. Among the inputs considered is crop land (x_1) measured in Fedden (equivalent to 0.42 hectares). Total labor input (x_2) is expressed in Egyptian Pounds and includes both family and hired labor. Chemical inputs (x_3) represent the expenditures (in Egyptian pounds) in fertilizers and pesticides. Other inputs (x_4) include energy, fuel and seed expenses and are also measured in monetary units. Table 1 provides summary statistics for the variables used in the analysis. With the exception of labor input, organic and conventional farms differ in terms of both inputs used and outputs produced. Conventional farms' cultivated area more than triples the area planted by organic farms. Also, the average value of conventional farm output (217,935 Egyptian Pounds) more than doubles the average output of their organic counterparts (90,553 Egyptian Pounds). This is in line with previous literature that has generally shown that conventional farms are usually larger than organic farms (Oude Lansink et al., 2002; Serra and Goodwin, 2009; Guesmi el al., 2012). Yields,

however, are superior in organic farms, which is mainly due to the organic produce price premium. This finding is in line with previous studies (Offermann and Nieberg, 2000; Oude Lansink et al., 2002; Oude Lansink and Jensma, 2003).

Table 1. Summary statistics for the variables of interest

Variable	Organic (n=30)		Conventional (n=30)		T-test of mean difference Significance level[2]
	Mean	Std. Dev.[1]	Mean	Std. Dev.[1]	
Total output (Egyptian Pound)	90,553.33	96,898.95	217,935.00	182,193.39	0.001*
Land (Feddan)	4.76	8.18	16.22	16.77	0.002*
Labor (Egyptian Pound)	8,413.33	5,332.72	11,516.67	13,610.72	0.252
Chemical inputs (Egyptian Pound)	4,715.00	3,869.64	47,188.33	56,946.76	0.000*
Other inputs (Egyptian Pound)	12,598.10	14,992.62	65,179.33	84,149.82	0.002*
Statistics on a per Feddan basis					
Total output (Egyptian Pound / Feddan)	28,954.44	13,372.32	20,499.63	11,483.83	0.012*
Labor (Egyptian Pound / Feddan)	3,413.18	2,459.82	1,132.03	1,204.08	0.000*
Chemical inputs (Egyptian Pound / Feddan)	1,921.80	2,252.02	3,813.39	2,353.50	0.003*
Other inputs (Egyptian Pound / Feddan)	4,088.27	3,009.86	5,046.22	2,931.66	0.221

[1]Std Dev: standard deviation. [2] * indicates statistical significance at the 5%.

Conventional (organic) farms spend 11,517 (8,413) Egyptian Pounds annually in labor input. On a per unit of land, organic farms are much more labor intensive than conventional farms (3,413 *vs.* 1,132 Egyptian Pounds per Feddan). Given the restrictions faced by organic farms regarding the use of chemical inputs, labor becomes much more relevant in these farms. To ensure immunity against pests and diseases, conventional farms spend quite a lot of money relative to organic farms (47,188 Egyptian Pounds *vs.* only 4,715 Egyptian Pounds). On a per Feddan basis, these expenses show that conventional farms are much more intensive in fertilizers and crop protection applications (3,813 Egyptian Pounds per Feddan) than organic farms (1,921 Egyptian Pounds per Feddan). This is not surprising given the legal regulations that substantially restrict the use of chemical inputs by Egyptian organic farms. Expenses in other inputs are rather low in organic farms compared to their conventional counterparts (12,598 Egyptian Pounds *vs.* 65,179 Egyptian Pounds). On a per Feddan basis, organic farms are less intensive in energy, fuel and seed use (4,088 Egyptian Pounds per Feddan) than conventional farms (5,046 Egyptian Pounds per Feddan).

Using the aforementioned variables and based on Kumbhakar et al.'s (2007) approach, the parametric frontier model is specified as a Cobb-Douglas function:

$$\log Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log x_1 + \beta_2 \log x_2 + \beta_3 \log x_3 + \beta_4 \log x_4 - u + v \tag{10}$$

It is worth noting that estimating the frontier for each observation in the sample allows overcoming any functional form misspecification. It also provides enough flexibility to capture the differences in production behavior across sample farms. The CV procedure defined above is used to select the bandwidth parameter required to derive the LML estimator of (10). Final results indicate that the bandwidths h_1, h_2, h_3 and h_4 take values of 4.45, 8.50, 5.12 and 5.65, respectively. Once the adequate bandwidth for our data is selected, the local parameter estimates are derived.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the variation in the local estimates of σ_u^2 and σ_v^2. These statistics support the presence of heterogeneity in the sample indicating an important degree of variability among observations regarding the proportion of the inefficiency term to the noise term ($\lambda = \sigma_u^2 / \sigma_v^2$).

Table 2. Summary statistics for the local estimates of σ_u^2, σ_v^2 and λ

Local estimates	σ_u^2	σ_v^2	λ
Maximum (100%)	0.183	0.093	30.117
Third quartile (75%)	4.895E-04	0.086	0.075
Median (50%)	7.610E-05	0.083	0.031
First quartile (25%)	1.130E-05	0.075	0.012
Minimum (0%)	1.458E-06	2.004E-04	0.004

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the variation of the estimates of the input coefficients for conventional and organic farms, respectively. Since a Cobb–Douglas functional form is assumed for our model, the coefficients represent input elasticities. The variation in the localized estimates supports that it is not reliable assuming the same input elasticities for all observations. For conventional farms, variation is especially important for land, with an elasticity that ranges from 16% to 75%, followed by chemical inputs, labor and other inputs, that have an elasticity fluctuating from 10% to 50%, 15% to 45% and 10% to 40%, respectively. In the case of organic farms, variation is relevant for land with an elasticity that ranges from 20% to 43%, followed by other inputs (20% to 40%), labor (20% to 38%) and chemical inputs (3% to 18%). Input elasticities indicate that both conventional and organic farms operate under decreasing returns to scale with a mean scale elasticity equal to 0.835 and 0.749, respectively (table 3). Hence, it is not recommendable to increase farm size for the purpose of increasing productivity.

Table 3. Distribution of production and scale elasticities for conventional and organic Egyptian Farms

| Elasticities	Conventional		Organic	
	Estimate	Std. Dev	Estimate	Std. Dev
Land	0.239	0.158	0.237	0.048
Labor	0.271	0.117	0.202	0.091
Chemical inputs	0.161	0.094	0.062	0.044
Other inputs	0.164	0.108	0.248	0.068
Returns to scale	0.835	0.086	0.749	0.055

Fig. 1 Distribution of localized estimates of input elasticities: conventional farming


Fig. 2 Distribution of localized estimates of input elasticities: organic farming

The localized elasticity estimates for both types of farms have the expected positive sign. On average, production elasticity estimates indicate that labor is the most productive input in conventional farming, followed by land, fertilizers and crop protection products. In organic farming, other inputs present the highest contribution to output increases followed by land, labor and crop protection inputs. The restrictions faced by organic farmers regarding the use of conventional inputs may be behind the low productivity of crop protection inputs, i.e., the authorized crop protection inputs may not be as productive as conventional ones. The fact that labor is more productive in conventional than in organic farming is compatible with the more restrictive use that conventional farms make of this input. Further, the low intensity with which organic farms use other inputs also explains the higher productivity of this input in organic produce.

The distribution of the localized efficiency estimates is shown in Table 4. Our empirical findings suggest high and similar TE performance for both farm types. Organic farmers, on average, are slightly more efficient than their conventional counterparts (97.5% and 96.4%, respectively), indicating that organic (conventional) farmers achieve 97.5% (96.4%) of their maximum potential output. High TE performance contributes to the firm's economic viability. This high level of efficiency is motivated by the scarcity of agricultural resources such as land and water which compels farmers to optimize their use. It also indicates that there is small scope, for both types of farms, to improve their economic results by reducing input use. Hence, in light of increasing input costs, both types of farms are likely to face reduced economic profits: organic (conventional) farms would only be able to increase their output by 2.5% (3.6%) if they were in the efficient frontier (i.e., by holding input level constant).

Serra and Goodwin (2009) found that organic arable crop farming in Spain has efficiency levels slightly below conventional farms (0.94 *vs.* 0.97). In any case, average efficiencies are close to the ones derived in our work. Comparison with other studies that use different methodologies can be conducted to provide a reference for our findings. Guesmi et al. (2012) used SFA and obtained TE scores of 0.80 and 0.64 for organic and conventional grape farms in Catalonia, respectively. These efficiency scores are very distant from ours and are likely due to heterogeneity in the sample. In another study, Oude Lansink et al. (2002) used DEA to compare organic and conventional crop and livestock farms in Finland and found that organic crop producers have higher efficiency than conventional farms 0.96 and 0.72, respectively. Our findings are also consistent with Tzouvelekas et al.'s results (2001; 2002a, b), who used the SFA approach to evaluate the TE levels achieved by Greek organic and conventional farms. They found organic producers to be more efficient than conventional ones for five types of farms, namely, wheat, olives, raisins, grapes and cotton (0.84 *vs.* 0.79, 0.69 *vs.* 0.54, 0.76 *vs.* 0.70, 0.68 *vs.* 0.62 and 0.75 *vs.* 0.71, respectively). However, our results are different from those derived by Bayramoglu and Gundogmus (2008), who assessed the efficiency of the Turkish grape sector using DEA techniques and suggested that conventional farms operate closer to their frontier than organic producers (0.90 *vs.* 0.86). In contrast with our findings, Madau (2007) used a SFA model and concluded that Italian conventional cereal farms are more efficient than organic farms (0.90 *vs.* 0.83). Differences in TE estimates found in the literature of productive efficiency of organic farming can be attributed to either the use of different methodologies or different production systems.

Technical efficiencies range from a minimum of 69% (81%) to a maximum of 100% (100%) for conventional (organic) farmers, indicating important heterogeneity within sample farms. However, a lower dispersion is found among organic farms: almost two thirds of organic farmers have efficiency ratings between 99% and 100%, whereas one half of conventional farmers display these high performance levels. This result is expected as the organic Egyptian farms are rather homogeneous regarding managing practices and area

cultivated, while conventional farms are more diverse ranging from very small farms to huge commercial ones.

Table 4. Frequency distribution of technical efficiency scores

TE (%)	Conventional	Organic
<90	3	4
90-95	2	0
95-99	10	5
99-100	15	21
Mean	0.964	0.975
Standard deviation	0.075	0.045
Minimum	0.694	0.811
Maximum	0.998	0.999

5. Concluding remarks

Despite the relevant growth in organic farming in Egypt, there is no study that focuses on the performance of organic farming in this country. Ours contributes to the scarce literature by conducting a comparative study of technical efficiency ratings for organic and conventional farms in Egypt. As well known, both parametric SFA and nonparametric DEA approaches present some shortcomings that may conduct to derive biased efficiency estimates. A new approach recently introduced by Kumbhakar et al. (2007) based on LML techniques allows to overcome these drawbacks by locally estimating the parameters of the deterministic and stochastic components of the frontier. Since using a robust methodology is important for sound decision making, LML methods are used in this article.

Our analysis is based on farm-level data which consists of 60 organic and conventional farms in Egypt. Empirical findings indicate substantial variation in efficiency estimates across observations. Results suggest that our sample farms operate with high mean efficiency scores and that organic farmers, on average, achieve higher technical efficiency levels than their conventional counterparts (0.97 and 0.96, respectively).

Our results allow deriving some interesting policy implications. Since high technical efficiency is a prerequisite for economic viability, knowledge that organic farms are at least as efficient as conventional farms may encourage more farmers to adopt organic practices. Higher organic yields in monetary units could further be improved by increased access to foreign and national markets offering attractive organic price premiums (Lohr and Salomonson, 2000). Finally, the low productivity of authorized organic fertilizers and crop protection inputs in organic farming, may be attributed to the lack of necessary information on how to adequately use these inputs. Specialized extension and training services providing technical assistance could improve production performance.

Our research can be extended in different ways. Given the increasing relevance of the environmental impacts of agriculture, correcting the technical efficiency estimates with environmental considerations would provide very useful information. Also, increasing the sample size by collecting more data can improve the reliability and the number of farms represented by our results. Consideration of risk issues in our efficiency analysis may refine research results. As is well known, agriculture is affected by both output and price risks that usually determine production decisions, which in turn can affect production efficiency.

References

Acs S., Berentsen P.B.M., Huirine R.B.M., 2007. Conversion to organic arable farming in the Netherlands: A dynamic linear programming analysis. Agricultural Systems 94, 405-415.

Aigner D., Lovell C.A.K., Schmidt P., 1977. Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production functions models. Journal of Econometrics 6, 21-37.

Bayramoglu Z., Gundogmus E., 2008. Cost Efficiency on organic farming: A comparison between organic and conventional raisin-producing households in Turkey. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research 6, 3-11.

Chakraborty K., Biswas B., Lewis W.C., 2001. Measurement of technical efficiency in public education: A stochastic and non-stochastic production function approach. Southern Economic Journal 67, 889-905.

Coelli T.J., Perelman S., 1999. A comparison of parametric and non-parametric distance functions: With application to European railways. European Journal of Operational Research 117, 326-339.

Fairweather J.R., 1999. Understanding how farmers choose between organic and conventional production: Results from New Zealand and policy implications. Agriculture and Human Values 16, 51-63.

Fan J., Gijbels I., 1996. *Local polynomial modeling and its applications*. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.

Ferrier R.S., Lovell C.A.K., 1990. Measuring cost efficiency in banking: An econometric and linear programming evidence. Journal of Econometrics 46, 229-245.

FiBL and IFOAM, 2011. The World of Organic Agriculture, statistics & emerging trends 2011. Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Ackerstrasse, Switzerland and International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Bonn, Germany.

Guesmi B., Serra T., Kallas Z., Gil J.M, 2012. The productive efficiency of organic farming: the case of grape sector in Catalonia. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research 10, 552-566.

Jondrow J., Lovell C.A.K., Materov I.S., Schmidt P. 1982. On the estimation of technical inefficiency in stochastic frontier production models. Journal of Econometrics 19, 233-238.

Kledal P.R, El-Araby A., Salem S.G., 2008. Country report: Organic food and farming in Egypt. Mediterranean region. The World of Organic Agriculture, statistics & emerging trends 2008. Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Ackerstrasse, Switzerland and International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Bonn, Germany.

Kumbhakar S.C., Byeong U.P., Simar L., Tsionas E.G., 2007. Nonparametric stochastic frontiers: A local maximum likelihood approach. Journal of Econometrics 137, 1-27.

Lohr L., Salomonson L., 2000. Conversion subsidies for organic production: Results from Sweden and lessons for the United States. Agricultural Economics 22, 133-146.

Madau F.A., 2007. Technical efficiency in organic and conventional farming: Evidence form Italian cereal farms. Agricultural Economics Review 8, 5-21.

Martins-Filho C., Yao F., 2007. Nonparametric frontier estimation via local linear regression. Journal of Econometrics 141, 283-319.

Meeusen W., Van Den Broek J., 1977. Efficiency estimation from Cobb-Douglas production functions with composed error. International Economic Review 18, 435-444.

Offermann F., Nieberg H., 2000. Economic performance of organic farms in Europe. Organic Farming in Europe. Economics and Policy 5, 1-198.

Oude Lansink A., Pietola K.S., Backman, S., 2002. Efficiency and productivity of conventional and organic farms in Finland 1994-1997. European Review of Agricultural Economics 29, 51-65.

Oude Lansink A., Jensma K., 2003. Analysing profits and economic behaviour of organic and conventional Dutch arable farms. Agricultural Economics Review 4, 19-31.

Padel S., 2001. Conversion to organic farming: A typical example of the diffusion of an innovation. Socialogia Ruralis 4, 40-61.

Parra López C., De Haro Giminez T., Calatrava Requena J., 2007. Diffusion and adoption of organic farming in the Southern Spanish olive groves. Journal of Sustainable Agriculture 30, 105-152.

Pietola K.S., Oude Lansink A., 2001. Farmer response to policies promoting organic farming technologies in Finland. European Review Agricultural Economics 28, 1-15.

Radwan A., Gil J.M., Diab Y. A. A., AboNahoul M., 2011. Determinants of the adoption of organic agriculture in Egypt using a duration analysis technique. Paper presented at the 85th Annual Conference, Warwick University, Coventry, UK, April 18-20.

Ruggiero J.,Vitaliano D., 1999. Assessing the efficiency of public schools using data envelopment analysis and frontier regression. Contemporary Economic Policy 17, 321-331.

SEKEM Organization. http://www.sekem.com.

Serra T., Goodwin B.K., 2009. The efficiency of Spanish arable crop organic farms, a local maximum likelihood approach. Journal of Productivity Analysis 3, 113-124.

Sharma K.R., Leung P., Zaleski H.M., 1999. Technical, allocative and economic efficiencies in swine production in Hawaii: A comparison of parametric and nonparametric approaches. Agricultural Economics 20, 23-35.

Tzouvelekas V, Pantzios CJ, Fotopoulos C, 2001. Technical efficiency of alternative farming systems: the case of Greek organic and conventional olive-growing farms. Food Policy 26, 549-569.

Tzouvelekas V, Pantzios CJ, Fotopoulos C, 2002a. Empirical evidence of technical efficiency levels in Greek organic and conventional farms. Agricultural Economics Review 3, 49-60.

Tzouvelekas V, Pantzios CJ, Fotopoulos C, 2002b. Measuring multiple and single factor technical efficiency in organic farming: the case of Greek wheat farms. British Food Journal 104, 591-609.

UNDP, 2011. Country Evaluation Egypt.

Wadud A., White B., 2000. Farm household efficiency in Bangladesh: A comparison of stochastic frontier and DEA methods. Applied Economics 32, 165-73.