

**AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY AND
CONSTRAINTS IN RICE FARMS USING DIFFERENT
IRRIGATION SYSTEMS IN TAMILNADU**

ABSTRACT

Rice is the staple food in India, improvement in efficiency levels is one of the major means of sustaining the staple food production and thereby ensuring food security. This study was taken up to determine the technical efficiency and constraints faced by the farmers in rice cultivation under different irrigation systems in Tamil Nadu. It could be concluded that the mean technical efficiency was 0.76, 0.75 and 0.71 for canal, well and tank irrigation system respectively. This showed that in the study region, the efficiency of the farmers were almost same for all the three systems of irrigation. The results of the Garrett's ranking technique indicated that non-availability of fertilizers at appropriate time, delay in getting subsidy for drip irrigation and fertigation systems and scarcity of irrigation water were the most important constraints in rice cultivation using canal, tank and well irrigation systems. Thus, productivity can be increased by adoption of non-monetary inputs like timely sowing, maintaining optimum plant population, timely irrigation, efficient use of fertilizers and irrigation water, need based plant protection measures and timely harvesting of crop.

Key Words: Rice cultivation, Technical Efficiency, Garrett's Ranking, Different irrigation systems

INTRODUCTION

Rice being the most important staple food in India, improvement in efficiency levels is one of the major means of sustaining the staple food production and thereby ensuring food security. The biophysical and socio-economic constraints of the rice farmers results in low technical efficiency as well as discourage farmers to bear the risk. Changes in productivity occur due to changes in technology and changes in technical efficiency (Jayaram *et al.*, 1992). The concept of technical

efficiency in rice cultivation relates to whether the rice farmers uses the best available technology in their production process. The technical efficiency may also be defined as the ability of the rice farmers to produce as much output as possible with a specified level of inputs, given the existing technology. The study was taken up to determine the technical efficiency of rice cultivation under different irrigation systems (canal, well and tank) in Tamil Nadu. Moreover, the study also explores the individual farm level technical efficiency of rice cultivation under different irrigation systems. The study attempts to compare farmers' responses with respect to technical efficiency in rice production depending upon the systems of irrigation in Tamil Nadu. In addition, the present study attempts to identify the constraints associated with the farmers in rice cultivation under different irrigation systems in Tamil Nadu.

METHODOLOGY

Measurement of Technical Efficiency using Stochastic Frontier Production Function Analysis

The stochastic frontier production function for estimating farm level technical efficiency (Goyal *et al.*, 2006) is specified as:

$$Y_i = f(X_i, \beta) + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where i is the n^{th} observations, Y_i is output, X_i denotes the actual input vector of production function and β is the vector of parameters of production function and ε is the error term that is composed of two elements, that is

$$\varepsilon_i = V_i - U_i \quad (2)$$

Where V_i is the symmetric disturbances assumed to be identically, independently and normally distributed as $N(0, \sigma_{V_i}^2)$ given the stochastic structure of the frontier. The second component U_i is a one sided error term that is independent of V_i and is normally distributed as $(0, \sigma_{U_i}^2)$, allowing the actual production to short fall below the frontier but without attributing all short

falls in output from the frontier as inefficiency.

The farm-specific technical efficiency is defined in terms of observed output (Y_i) to the corresponding frontier output (Y_i^*) using the available technology derived which is defined as follows:

$$TE_i = \frac{Y_i}{Y_i^*} = \frac{E(Y_i/u_i, X_i)}{E(Y_i/u_i=0, X_i)} \\ = E [\exp(-U_i)/\varepsilon_i] \quad (3)$$

TE takes values within the interval (0, 1), where 1 indicates a fully efficient firm.

The stochastic frontier production function model (Hazarika, C and S.R. Subramanian, 1999) specified for rice crop is given below.

$$\ln(Y) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\ln X_1) + \beta_2 \ln(X_2) + \beta_3 \ln(X_3) + \beta_4 \ln(X_4) + \beta_5 \ln(X_5) + \beta_6 \ln(X_6) + \beta_7 \ln(X_7) + \\ \beta_8 \ln(X_8) + \beta_9 \ln(X_9) + (V_i - U_i)$$

Where

Y	=	Yield of Paddy (Kg/ha)
X ₁	=	Seed (Kg/ha.)
X ₂	=	Human labour (man days/ha.)
X ₃	=	Machine power (hp hrs. /ha.)
X ₄	=	Farm yard manure (tonnes/ha)
X ₅	=	Plant protection chemicals (Rs/ha.)
X ₆	=	Nitrogen (Kg/ha.)
X ₇	=	Phosphorous (Kg/ha.)
X ₈	=	Potash (Kg/ha.)
X ₉	=	Irrigation (ha.cm.)
β ₀	=	ln β ₀ = Regression Constant
β ₁ , β ₂ , β ₃ , β ₄ ,..... β ₉	=	Elasticity coefficients

Garrett's Ranking Technique

Garrett's ranking technique was employed to rank the factors that influenced the particular type of rice cultivation by the farmers. The order of merit given by the respondents was transmitted into score. For converting the ranks assigned by the farmer towards the constraint in different types of rice cultivation, per cent position was worked out for each rank using the formula:

95 Per cent position of each rank = $\frac{100(R_{ij} - 0.5)}{N_j}$

96 R_{ij} = Rank given for i^{th} constraint by j^{th} individual

97 N_j = Number of constraint ranked by j^{th} individual

98 The percentage position of each rank then was converted into scores by referring them to table
99 given by Garrett and Woodworth (1969).

100 Then for each constraint, the scores of individual farmers were added together and divided by
101 the total number of farmers, for whose scores were added. The mean scores for all the constraints
102 were arranged in descending order and ranks were given. The important constraints in rice cultivation
103 were identified based on the ranks of the constraints.

104 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

105 **Technical Efficiency in Rice Farms - Stochastic Production Frontier using MLE**

106 **Method**

107 The technical efficiency of canal, well and tank irrigated rice cultivating farmers was
108 estimated by using the stochastic frontier production function of Cobb-Douglas form using the MLE
109 method. The stochastic frontier function analysis attempted in this study had the rice output kg/ha as
110 the dependent variable and independent variables included were, human labour (man days/ha.), machine
111 power (hp hrs./ha), seed rate (Kgs/ha), FYM (tonnes/ha), PPC (Rs./ha), nitrogen (Kgs/ha), phosphorus
112 (Kgs/ha), potassium (Kgs/ha), and irrigation (ha.cm). The Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) of
113 the parameters of Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier function were obtained using maximum
114 likelihood procedures through FRONTIER 4.1 package and the results are presented in Table below.

115 **Canal Irrigated Rice Cultivation**

116 MLE results showed that in canal irrigated system of rice cultivation, the quantity of human
117 labour and irrigation had significance at 1 per cent level. The estimate of γ would refer to ratio of the

variance of farm specific performance of Technical efficiency (σ_u^2) to the total variance of output (σ_v^2). A high value for γ (0.99) would indicate the presence of significant inefficiency in the production of the crop. The estimate of γ would indicate that 99 per cent of the difference between the observed and frontier output was mainly due to the inefficient use of resources, which were under the control of the farmers. The remaining portion i.e., 1 per cent was due to factors beyond the farmers' control. The average technical efficiency was estimated at 76 per cent indicating that output can be raised by 24 per cent through following efficient crop management practices without actually increasing the level of application of inputs.

Tank Irrigated Rice Cultivation

MLE results showed that in tank irrigated system of rice cultivation, the application of N, P and irrigation were positively significant at 1 per cent level. Human labour and seed rate were significant at 5 per cent level. The estimate of γ was 0.91 which would indicate that 91 per cent of the difference between the observed and frontier output was mainly due to the inefficient use of resources which were under the control of the farmers. The remaining portion 0.9, i.e., 9 per cent was due to factors beyond the farmers' control. The mean technical efficiency (MTE) was only 0.71 which would imply that, on an average, the sample farmers would realize only 71 per cent of their technical abilities and the remaining 29 per cent accounted for the inefficiency of the farmers. Thus, the technical efficiency showed that there would be a reasonably good scope for increasing the productivity of rice with the existing level of input use in the study region by adopting better crop management practices.

Well Irrigated Rice Cultivation

The MLE results showed that in well irrigated system of rice cultivation, the human labour was significant at 1 per cent level, whereas the inputs like FYM, PPC and irrigation were significant at 5 per cent level. The estimate of γ was 0.75 which would indicate that 75 per cent of the difference between the observed and frontier output was primarily due to factors which were under the control of farmers. The remaining portion of 25 per cent was due to factors beyond the farmers' control. The estimated mean technical efficiency was 0.75 implying that, on an average, the sample farmers would

146 realize only 75 per cent of their technical abilities and the remaining 25 per cent showed the
147 inefficiency of the farmers.

148

149 It could be concluded that the mean technical efficiency was 0.76, 0.75 and 0.71 for canal,
150 well and tank irrigation system respectively. This showed that in the study region, the efficiency of
151 the farmers were almost same for all the three systems of irrigation. Thus, productivity can be
152 increased by adoption of non-monetary inputs like timely sowing, maintaining optimum plant
153 population, timely irrigation, efficient use of fertilizers and irrigation water, need based plant
154 protection measures and timely harvesting of crop.

Sl. No.	Variables	Thanjavur (Canal)			Sivagangai (Tank)			Salem (Well)		
		Coefficient	Std. error	t value	Coefficient	Std. error	t value	Coefficient	Std. error	t value
A	Frontier production function									
1.	Constant	5.928*	0.704	8.426	4.830*	0.474	10.200	4.875*	0.637	7.654
2.	Human labour (man days/ ha.)	0.724*	0.129	5.619	0.284**	0.139	2.049	0.325*	0.049	6.680
3.	Machine power (hp. hrs/ha.)	-0.486***	0.249	-1.946	0.034 ^{NS}	0.043	0.804	0.080 ^{NS}	0.084	0.949
4.	Seed rate (kgs/ha.)	0.346***	0.181	1.910	0.076**	0.027	2.850	0.029 ^{NS}	0.041	0.701
5.	Farm Yard Manure (tonnes/ha.)	-0.232***	0.136	-1.710	-0.025 ^{NS}	0.026	-0.972	0.119**	0.040	2.951
6.	PPC (Rs/ha.)	0.034 ^{NS}	0.034	0.990	0.034 ^{NS}	0.120	0.282	0.163**	0.072	2.276
7.	Nitrogen (kgs/ha.)	-0.485*	0.113	-4.273	0.262*	0.059	4.441	0.076***	0.043	1.767
8.	Phosphorous (kgs/ha.)	0.028 ^{NS}	0.038	0.736	0.178*	0.043	4.128	0.094 ^{NS}	0.073	1.284
9.	Potash (kgs/ha)	0.149***	0.081	1.829	-0.019 ^{NS}	0.062	-0.316	-0.056 ^{NS}	0.057	-0.975
10.	Irrigation (ha.cm)	0.506*	0.117	4.293	0.318*	0.045	7.080	0.152**	0.071	2.142
B.	Diagnosis Statistics									
11.	Sigma-square (σ^2)	0.192*	0.016		0.072*	0.017		0.197*	0.065	
12.	Gamma (γ)	0.999*	0.0002		0.912*	0.064		0.752*	0.199	
13.	Log- likelihood	7.38			30.19			21.44		
14.	Mean technical efficiency	0.76			0.71			0.75		
15.	Mean technical inefficiency	0.24			0.29			0.25		
16.	Number of Observations	80			80			80		

156 * - 1 % level of significance

** - 5 % level of significance

157 *** - 10 % level of significance

NS - Non significance

Distribution of Farmers according to Technical Efficiency Ratings

Distribution of sample farmers according to different technical efficiency ratings of canal, well and tank irrigation systems were presented in Table.

Distribution of Farmers according to Technical Efficiency Ratings

(Number of farmers)

Sl. No	Technical efficiency rating	Canal	Tank	Well
1	<60%	11 (13.75)	15 (18.75)	8 (10.00)
2	61% - 70%	12 (15.00)	20 (25.00)	13 (16.25)
3	71% - 80%	26 (32.50)	26 (32.50)	25 (31.25)
4	81% - 90%	22 (27.50)	15 (18.75)	30 (37.50)
5	>90%	9 (11.20)	4 (5.00)	4 (5.00)
	Total	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)

(Figures in parentheses indicates percentage to total)

Canal Irrigated Rice Cultivation

The results showed that 11.20 per cent of farmers using canal system of irrigation to cultivate rice were found to operate at technical efficiency rating of more than 0.90. About 14 per cent of farmers were found to be operating at technical efficiency rating of below 0.60 per cent.

Tank Irrigated Rice Cultivation

The results showed that five per cent of farmers using tank system of irrigation to cultivate rice were found to operate at technical efficiency rating of more than 0.90. About 19 per cent of farmers were found to be operating at technical efficiency rating of below 0.60 per cent.

Well Irrigated Rice Cultivation

The results showed that five per cent of the farmers using well irrigation system to cultivate rice were found to operate at technical efficiency rating of more than 0.90. About 10.00 per cent of farmers were found to be operating at technical efficiency rating of below 0.60 per cent

It could be concluded that there was a variation in the level of technical efficiencies among the sample farmers who cultivated rice using different systems of irrigation. The sample farmers using canal system of irrigation for rice cultivation were technically efficient when compared to the farmers using tank and well system of irrigation for rice cultivation. This was due to the larger adoption of System of Rice Intensification technology among the sample farmers in Thanjavur district.

These results are important in that they provide detailed information to policy makers on the nature of production technologies used in farms. Thus, there was a scope to bridge the gap between the actual or realized and the potential output with the given technology by using available resources more efficiently.

Constraints Faced by the Farmers in Rice Cultivation in the Selected Districts.

Garrett's ranking technique was employed to find out the constraints faced by the rice cultivating farmers using canal, tank and well irrigation systems and the results are presented in Table below

Constraint Analysis in Rice Cultivation under Different Irrigation Systems of the Selected Districts using Garrett's Ranking Technique

Sl. No	Constraints	Canal (Thanjavur)		Tank (Sivagangai)		Well (Salem)	
		Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
1	Scarcity of irrigation water	46	IV	54	III	77	I
2	Non availability fertilizer at appropriate time	77	I	46	IV	54	III
3	Labour scarcity in peak season	54	III	36	V	36	V
4	Unremunerative price	63	II	23	VI	46	IV
5	Inadequate supply of electricity	36	V	63	II	63	II
6	Delay in getting subsidy for irrigation structures	23	VI	77	I	23	VI

Canal Irrigated Rice Cultivation

The most important constraint in cultivation of rice using canal irrigation system was non availability of fertilizer at appropriate time followed by unremunerative price, labour scarcity in peak season, scarcity of irrigation water, inadequate supply of electricity and delay in getting subsidy for irrigation structures. Non-availability of fertilizer at appropriate time of cultivation was mainly due to poor supply of fertilizers in the inputs supply markets, cooperative societies and local fertilizer shops.

213 **Tank Irrigated Rice Cultivation**

214 The most important constraint in cultivation of rice using tank irrigation system was
215 scarcity of irrigation water followed by inadequate supply of electricity, non availability of
216 fertilizer at appropriate time, unremunerative price, labour scarcity in peak seasons and delay in
217 getting subsidy for irrigation schemes.

218 **Well Irrigated Rice Cultivation**

219 The most important constraint in cultivation of rice using well irrigation system was
220 delay in getting subsidy for irrigation schemes followed by inadequate supply of electricity,
221 scarcity of irrigation water, non availability of fertilizer at appropriate time, labour scarcity in
222 peak seasons, and unremunerative price. Most of the sample farmers in Salem district cultivated
223 rice under well irrigation system, for which, the Government of Tamil Nadu provided subsidy of
224 100 per cent to small and marginal farmers and 75 per cent to all other farmers for establishing
225 drip irrigation and fertigation system and installment of these structures.

226 The results on the analysis of constraints in rice cultivation by the sample farmers in the
227 study area using Garrett's ranking technique indicated that non-availability of fertilizers at
228 appropriate time, delay in getting subsidy for drip irrigation and fertigation systems and scarcity
229 of irrigation water were the most important constraints in rice cultivation using canal, tank and
230 well irrigation systems in Thanjavur, Sivagangai and Salem districts respectively.

231 **Conclusions**

232 The technical efficiency of the farmers was almost same for all the three systems of
233 irrigation. Thus, productivity can be increased by adoption of non-monetary inputs like timely
234 sowing, maintaining optimum plant population, timely irrigation, efficient use of fertilizers and

irrigation water, need based plant protection measures and timely harvesting of crop. The results Garrett's ranking technique indicated that non-availability of fertilizers at appropriate time, delay in getting subsidy for drip irrigation and fertigation systems and scarcity of irrigation water were the most important constraints in rice cultivation using canal, tank and well irrigation systems in Thanjavur, Sivagangai and Salem districts respectively. Hence, the government should ensure necessary actions to regularize the availability of subsidy to the eligible farmers in an appropriate time. Provision of timely and adequate inputs and infrastructure supported with mechanization, credit availability and proper guidance through services may help to raise the technical efficiency of farms under all the systems of irrigation.

REFERENCES:

- Jayaram, H., G. S. Chandrashekar and L. Achoth (1992), "An Economic Analysis of Technical Efficiency in Rice Cultivation of Mandya – Some Issues in Resource Pricing", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 47: 677-682.
- Hazarika, C. and S. R. Subramanian (1999), "Estimation of Technical Efficiency in the Stochastic Frontier Production Function Model- An Economic Application to the Industry in Assam", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 54: 201-211.
- Goyal, S.K., K. S. Suhag and U.K. Pandey, "An estimation of technical efficiency of paddy farmers in Haryana state of India ", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economic*, 61(1): 108-122, 2006.
- Garret, H.E. and R.S. Woodworth. (1969). Statistics in psychology and education. *Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd.*, Bombay, 329.

- Anupama, J., R.P., Singh and K., Ranjit, 2005, "Technical efficiency in maize production in Madhya Pradesh: Estimation and Implication", *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 18(2): 305-315.
- Basavaraja, H., S.B., Mahajanashetti and P., Sivanagaraju, 2008, "Technological Change in Paddy Production: A Comparative Analysis of Traditional and SRI methods of Cultivation", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 63 (4): 629-640.
- Bozoglu, M. and V., Ceyhana, 2007, "Measuring the Technical Efficiency and Exploring the Inefficiency Determinants of Vegetable Farms in Samsun Province, Turkey", *Agricultural Systems*, 94(3): 649-656.
- Bravo-Ureta, B.E. and Rieger, L., 1990, "Dairy Farm Efficiency Measurement Using Stochastic Frontiers and Neoclassical Duality", *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 73: 421-428.
- Garrett, H.E. and R.S., Woodworth, 1969, "Statistics in Psychology and Education", Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, p. 329.
- Hazarika, C. and S.R., Subramanian, 1999, "Estimation of Technical Efficiency in the Stochastic Frontier Production Function Model- An Economic Application to the Industry in Assam", *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 54: 201-211.