



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.*



©IFAD/Andrew Esiebo/Panos

Technical efficiency and technological change of value chains in five Nigerian states

Neha Paliwal (Wageningen U. & Research), Tisorn Songsermsawas (IFAD), Carlo Azzarri (IFPRI), and Boris Bravo-Ureta (U. of Connecticut)

IAAE Interconference Symposium

19 April 2023



Motivation

- Many of the poor worldwide are small-scale producers.
- They face numerous production constraints and market frictions.
- Strengthening access to markets and participating in value chains can contribute to improving productivity and income.
- Mid-stream segment of value chains often under-researched.
- Market access allows adding value to raw crops after harvest, through higher demand for processed commodities.
- Context: Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP) in Nigeria

Literature

- Addressing bias form unobservable characteristics (Bravo-Ureta et al. 2012)
- Applications of the Selectivity-Corrected Stochastic Production Frontier (SC-SPF) method in agricultural development studies (Abdul-Rahaman et al. 2021, Bravo-Ureta et al. 2020, Olagunju et al. 2021, Issahaku and Abdulai 2020)
- Applications of the stochastic metafrontier (SMF) framework to agricultural production studies (Lawin and Tamini 2019, Ngango and Hong 2021)

Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP)



Time frame:

2012- 2022

Total population reached:

100,000 households

Goal: Sustainably enhance incomes and food security of poor rural households engaged in production, processing, and marketing of rice and cassava in targeted states

Budget: US\$ 329.5 million from IFAD (65%), other co-financiers (11%), local private sector (16%), and beneficiaries (7%)

Project activities:

- ***Agricultural Marketing Development:***
Support to value addition and market linkages; support to market infrastructure
- ***Smallholder Productivity Enhancement:***
Strengthening of farmers organizations (facilitating access to inputs, improved technologies, credit, and information); support to smallholder production



Data

- Source: Household and producer organization survey collected as part of impact evaluation of VCDP
- Interview time: February-March 2020
- Sample: 1,784 Households and 228 FOs in 5 states
 - 879 treatment households
 - 905 control households

Counterfactual construction

- M&E data used to identify treated FOs, and randomly selected them stratified by state and crop
- Selection of extension wards with characteristics suitable for rice and cassava cultivation
- Control FOs randomly selected based in extension wards, proportionally balanced to treated sample




Methodology

1. Pre-processing: Probit model to match treatment and control households based on:
 - Household-level pre-treatment socio-economic characteristics
 - Community-level access to infrastructures
2. Controlling for differences in unobservables: SC-SPF
 - One-step estimation of a probit sample selection model and an SPF model with a two-sided error term
 - Selectivity is expressed by the correlation between the error term in the sample selection and the two-sided error in the stochastic frontier
 - Cobb-Douglas functional form with production theory



Methodology (cont.)

3. Stochastic Meta-Frontier (SMF)

- Common benchmark to compare technical efficiency of two groups



Results: Probit model



- Bias minimized by the matching algorithm
- Substantial common support between treated and control households

Results: Conventional SPF

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Conventional SPF Basic	Conventional SPF Pooled	Conventional SPF Treatment	Conventional SPF Control
Treatment	0.273*** (0.0810)	0.228*** (0.0712)		
Land	0.764*** (0.0768)	0.725*** (0.0728)	0.551*** (0.0916)	0.867*** (0.108)
Labor	0.246*** (0.0358)	0.210*** (0.0338)	0.201*** (0.0437)	0.211*** (0.0539)
Purchased inputs (binary)	0.620*** (0.171)	0.559*** (0.158)	0.574** (0.244)	0.520*** (0.198)
Constant	5.208*** (0.307)	5.172*** (0.461)	5.873*** (0.717)	4.974*** (0.530)
Other controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Technical efficiency (TE)	49%	50%	50%	48%
Observations	1,454	1,454	718	736
Clustered standard errors in parentheses				
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1				

- Land, labor, and purchased inputs are all statistically significant



Preliminary findings

- Statistically significant parameters within the expected range
- Parameters estimates suggest increasing returns to scale
- TE gap between treated and control households, though small (2 percentage points)

Next steps

- Implement SC-SPF model and compare results with conventional SPF model to assess the role of (and quantify) sample selection
- Implement SMF model
- Calculate metafrontier efficiency scores
- Conduct heterogeneity analysis across sub-groups (e.g. by farm size, by education level, etc.)
- Provide sensitivity analysis based on different model specifications to check robustness of results



Any questions?



Thank you!