

Determinants of Smallholder Farmers' Demand for Purchased Inputs in Lilongwe District, Malawi: Evidence from Mitundu Extension Planning Area

¹M. Assa, ¹A. Mehire, ¹K. Ngoma, ¹E. Magombo and ²P. Gondwe

¹Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics,
Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, Malawi, Zomba

²Department of Agribusiness, Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, Malawi, Zomba

Abstract: The aim of this study was to empirically determine the factors that affect smallholder farmers' demand for purchased fertilizer and seed using cross section data from 160 farmers. Model solutions, which were created by using Translog Cost Function were carried out by Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR). To this end this study revealed that education, field size (plot of land cultivated) and household size have significant negative relationship with the share of fertilizer purchased and positively related with share of seed. Whereas price of output, seed, fertilizer and income of the household are found to be significant and positively related to share of fertilizer and negatively related with share of purchased seed.

Key words: Translog • Cost • Purchased inputs • Demand

INTRODUCTION

It is widely accepted that increased use of purchased inputs (seeds, chemicals and fertilizers) has a critical place, alongside organic soil fertility enhancement practices, in the technical change needed for sustained smallholder agricultural growth in Africa. However, purchased input use is very low amongst the farmers especially from Sub-Saharan Africa and has remained largely static over the last 20 years or so, with particularly low usage in smallholder food-crop production where constraints on expanded purchased inputs (seed and fertilizer) use exists on both the supply and demand sides.

Hybrid seed and chemical fertilizer utilization of the smallholder farmers ought to improve over time and space. Just as there is strong correlation between crop yield and the volume of purchase input utilization, so there ought to exist a relationship between the purchased input consumption of the farmer and selected socio-economic factors [3] which are at play in the micro environment in which the farmer operates. But it is difficult to generalize about the economic variables that are responsible for the growth in purchased inputs demand. For instance, variables which may correlate with purchase input

consumption may relate to price of farm produce, market access conditions, fertilizer price per bag, farm size, farm income to mention but a few and each could have its own set of assumption [1-3].

In Malawi, the most fundamental input that may be purchased is seed (i.e. improved) and as farmers intensify, fertilizer is the next most crucial input to be purchased. However, most of agricultural inputs have been subject to dramatic price increases [4], as a result, farmers are scarcely able to afford purchased inputs especially those not included in the government sponsored scheme (i.e. subsidy; which targets 50% of the total smallholder population) because they have limited purchasing power as their average annual income per household MK50,000 [5]. As such, purchased agricultural inputs represent a major expenditure. Even when farmers can afford to purchase the inputs, they may be unavailable. Despite large numbers of farmers i.e. over 85% of the rural population [6], they represent very small markets for agricultural inputs, largely because of low purchasing power. Therefore, they must generally travel some distance to locate inputs with no guarantee of success. As such distance, plays a negative effect on the use of purchased inputs [7].

The farmers are also constrained by the lack of information on, for example, prices, appropriate time to apply inputs, yield responses, appropriate inputs etc. Even assuming that the information exists, it may not be within easy reach of farmers because extension services within the country have been severely affected by public sector budgetary constraints leaving many workers with their salaries paid but without funds to visit farmers [8]. The decision on the use of purchased inputs requires information on prices and in thin markets (i.e. those with low and uneven volumes of transactions over time), prices can be particularly uncertain and variable. Lastly, farmer willingness to purchase inputs is also affected by risk and uncertainty. Low and uncertain rainfall is closely linked to low use of purchased inputs, since it creates additional yield risk and due to the volatility of output prices, farmers are unwilling to apply inputs for fear that they may not cover costs [9].

This paper builds on previous studies done by [10] on fertilizer use in Africa, [11] on farmer demand for fertilizer in Sub Saharan Africa, [12] and [13] on factors affecting fertilizer adoption and demand and [14] on factors affecting improved seed demand. Thus, the objective of this paper is to determine the factors that affect smallholder farmers' demand for purchased inputs. The paper will utilize data which is an area representative obtained from the Lilongwe Agricultural Development Division that was collected during a survey in 2008. The survey sampled 160 households, of which more than 80% had agricultural activities as their main source of livelihood.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Theoretical and Empirical Model: The study assumes that a farm household to a large extent faces more effective markets (though not perfectly competitive) for other farm inputs like fertilizer and seed. Differences in transaction costs in different rural locations, affects the return to individual smallholder farm households from the purchase of fertilizer from urban markets and the value of product which is normally sold at the farm level [15].

For most small holder farmer households who operate in the imperfect market environments their utility and profit maximizing decisions are jointly determined, where the optimal production and consumption levels are determined within an integrated framework [15]. But given the desired level of output that gives the maximum utility or profit level, these farmers (producers) would want to

minimize their respective cost of production, notably costs of purchased inputs. Hence, producers will minimize their production cost, given their respective level of output. Therefore, let the production function of a farm be given as:

$$q = q(X, Z, H) \tag{1}$$

Where; q , represents the household's farm output (i.e. maize harvested), whilst X , Z and H present vectors of purchased input quantity (fertilizer and seed), household fixed factor and household characteristics, respectively (i.e. all the variables have been mentioned above). The production function (equation 1) is assumed to be a concave function: it is twice differentiable where $\partial^2 q(*) / \partial X^2 > 0$ and $\partial^2 q(*) / \partial X^2 < 0$.

The cost of purchased input is given by:

$$C = Xp \tag{2}$$

Where, p is vector of input prices (which also reflects the differences in transaction costs for input at various locations). We assume that farmers minimize their cost of production subject to their respective level of output.

$$\begin{aligned} \min C &= Xp \\ \text{s.t } q &= q(X, Z, H) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Setting up the Lagrange function:

$$L = Xp + \lambda(q - q(X, Z, H)) \tag{4}$$

Solving the first order conditions and adding vectors of household fixed factors and other characteristics of the farm household give a vector of purchased factor input function of the form:

$$X^* = x(p, q, Z, H) \tag{5}$$

Substituting equation 5 into equation 2, the corresponding minimum cost function is derived as:

$$C^* = c(p, q, Z, H) \tag{6}$$

Christensen *et al.*, (1973) derived factor cost share equations by transloging the cost function. The translog cost function is flexible and does not impose priori restrictions on scale economies and substitution of factors. The translog cost function is the most particularly

useful function for estimating the factor demand functions [16, 17].

Rewriting equation 6 in natural logarithm, the cost function C^* takes the form,

$$\ln C^* = c(\ln p, \ln q, \ln Z, \ln H) \quad (7)$$

Where; p, q, z and h are defined above. We impose the symmetry and constant returns to scale conditions and then some of the coefficients (coefficients of interest) of the total cost function are estimated. With the constant returns to scale condition imposed, the output term ($\ln q$) is omitted from equation 7 and the cost function is specified as an average cost function (C^{**}). With this approach cost share equations are derived and estimated, directly using the seemingly unrelated regression technique as described by [16]. The derivative of translog cost function with respect to a factor price (i.e. Shephard Lemma), which gives the cost share of the purchased factor input in total cost, is:

$$s_i = \frac{\partial \ln C^{**}}{\partial \ln p_i} = \beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_{ij} \ln p_j + \sum_m \pi_{im} \ln Z_m + \sum_k \pi_{ik} \ln H_k \quad (8)$$

Where; s_i is the cost share of the “ith” factor in total farm cost. The cost shares for the purchased inputs are calculated as:

$$s_i = \frac{p_i X_i}{I} \quad (9)$$

Where $I = \sum p_i x_i$

The cost shares equations are estimated for fertilizer (S_F) and Seed (S_S). They are expressed from equation 13 and after adding some dummy variables they can be represented as:

$$S_F = \beta_F + \alpha_{FF} P_F + \alpha_{FS} \ln P_S + \pi_{FL} \ln Z_L + \pi_{FI} \ln H_I + \pi_{FP} \ln H_P + \pi_{FE} \ln H_E + \pi_{FA} \ln H_A + \pi_{FD} \ln H_D + \pi_{FX} D_X \quad (15)$$

$$S_S = \beta_S + \alpha_{SF} P_F + \alpha_{SS} \ln P_S + \pi_{SL} \ln Z_L + \pi_{SI} \ln H_I + \pi_{SP} \ln H_P + \pi_{SE} \ln H_E + \pi_{SA} \ln H_A + \pi_{SD} \ln H_D + \pi_{SX} D_X \quad (16)$$

Where; β_i, α_{ij} and π_{im} are coefficients, P_F and P_S are prices of fertilizer and seed, Z_L, H_I, H_P, H_E, H_A and H_D are household’s landholding (fixed factor), household income level, household size, education, age of household head, distance to the input market respectively. D_X is Dummy for access to extension service.

This study estimates the system of cost share equation for fertilizer and seed using their prices and farm household (socio-economic) characteristics [17] and [18] have followed similar approach to describe production structure of agriculture in Kenya and Zimbabwe, respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that the land area allocated to Maize was small at an average of 0.43 hectares. The average age of the sample farmers was 41.7 years with a minimum of 22 and maximum of 75 years. Mean household head’s farming experience was 10 years and 4 years of formal education. The farm size in the sample was between 0.52 to 2.35 ha with a mean of 0.75 ha and a standard deviation of 0.56 ha.

On average, the sampled farms reported a mean yield of 1475kg/ha while the yields vary between a low of 375kgs/ha and a high 4447kgs/ha, suggesting considerable room for improving Maize yields. The results reported that there are 20% households headed by females. This ratio is much deviated from the literature by [19] who estimated that the majority of households (about 70%) in the country are headed by males. The lowest income level was found to be MK200 and the highest was MK8 000 with mean of MK1996.98 and standard deviation of MK1 784.47.

Table 1: Parameter Estimates for Seemingly Unrelated Regression Model

Regressors	Purchased Inputs	
	Share of Fertilizer Parameter (Std Err)	Share of Seed Parameter (Std Err)
Intercept	-16.296 (4.168)***	17.296 (4.168)***
LnEdu	-0.119 (0.014)***	0.119 (0.014)***
LnFieldSize	-0.115 (0.018)***	0.115 (0.018)***
LnIncome	0.067 (0.021)***	-0.067 (0.021)***
LnPrice	0.102 (0.040)**	-0.102 (0.040)**
LnHHsize	-0.140 (0.037)***	0.140 (0.037)***
LnAge	0.006 (0.021)	-0.006 (0.021)
LnSeedPrice	2.806 (0.776)***	-2.806 (0.776)***
LnFertPrice	0.189 (0.017)***	-0.189 (0.017)***
Extension	-0.007 (0.014)	0.007 (0.014)

R Squared = 0.749 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.703)

Breusch-Pagan test of independence: $\chi^2 = 27.432$, P-value = 0.102241

VIF = 3.98

Source: Computed from Field Survey Data, 2009

***indicates variables that are significant at 1% level. **indicates variables that are significant at 5% level. *indicates variables that are significant at 10% level. Values in parenthesis are standard errors. Ln means logarithm.

In order to control for data reliability and validity; a number of measurements were effected. The test for homoskedasticity of variance was conducted using Breusch-Pagan test for heteroskedasticity as explained by [20] under the null hypothesis of constant variances of the residuals. The p-value for Breusch-Pagan test is 0.1022, which is greater than the 10% level of significance. This leads to the decision of failing to reject the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity of residues. Thus, for all practical purposes, we conclude that there is no heteroscedasticity. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) method was used to detect multicollinearity and was preferred over the correlation coefficient method which does not give conclusive results [21]. VIF registered a value of 3.98 which according to [22] is within the acceptable range on a scale of 1 to 10.

The results from the above table denote that both price of seed and fertilizer are significant at 1% with a positive association on share of fertilizer and negative association on share of seed, showing that the price of this inputs significantly affect farmers demand for purchased inputs. The results are similar with findings of other studies like [23] who found a positive relationship between price of fertilizer and intensity of its use.

On the other hand, the price of output is positive and significant. This suggests that farmers base their decision to use fertilizer not only on the fertilizer price, rather also on the price of output in question. This suggests that, if the price of output were to be increased, farmers would increase purchases of fertilizer using even the resources meant for seed purchases.

Household Size and share of fertilizer portrayed an inverse relationship whilst having a positive relationship with share of seed. [24] used household size as a proxy for labour. [17] and [25] reported highest substitutability between fertilizer and labour. Family labour is the cheapest form of labour form smallholder farmer and relatively very cheap compared to fertilizer. Thus, the negative relationship between household size and share of fertilizer might be substantiated by Obare's findings. With this fertilizer labour substitutability, it can be inferred that, with big household size which means more cheap labour, resources for purchasing fertilizer are reallocated to family labour and seed purchase.

From the econometric estimation results, it is shown that extension has insignificant negative relationship with the share of fertilizer and positive with share of seed. The sign of the relationship can be due to the fact that extension service will enhance the use of modern

inputs with alternative applications and substitutes. The insignificance of the parameter estimate implies there is very limited extension service in the area which is consistence with the 'shortage extension workers in Malawi' as reported by [6]. Age is one of the household characteristics that are deemed to influence demand for purchased inputs in this study. The results indicate insignificant positive relationship with share of fertilizer. The reasoning is that with age, farmers gain more experience and acquaintance with new technologies and hence are expected to have higher ability to demand new technologies more efficiently. On the other hand, there is a negative relationship between age and share of seed as with age farmers become more conservative and less amenable to change.

The results reported a mean of 4 years of formal education of the household head which showed a negative relationship with the share of fertiliser. However the results showed a positive relationship between the education of household head and the share of seed. This could be attributed to the likelihood that education would improve the perceptions of farmers on the agro-economic potential of improved seed hence increase their effective demand. The household income level showed a positive relation with the share of fertiliser. It is postulated that improvements in income will move a farmer along the same demand curve to a higher quantity of fertilizer used. However a negative relationship was showed between the share of seed and household income level. This suggests that the purchase of fertiliser is relatively more important to the farmers than the purchase of improved seed. The estimated positive and negative effects of household's land size on cost shares of seed and fertilizer respectively, were consistent with processes for agricultural intensification (transformation). This implies as land size increases farmers use large quantity of seed and relatively small amount of fertilizer. The sign indicated that demand of seed is positively related with field size and the vice versa is true for demand of fertilize.

CONCLUSION

It is unquestionable that empirical knowledge about the demand of seed and fertilizer by small scale farmers is a key to come up with appropriate policy to enhance production and productivity of the farmers. To this end this study revealed that education, field size (plot of land cultivated) and household size have significant negative

relationship with the share of fertilizer purchased and positively related with share of seed. Whereas price of output, seed, fertilizer and income of the household are found to be significant and positively related to share of fertilizer and negatively related with share of purchased seed. From this we can conclude that policy measures such as: intervention via the input and output market, family planning, land reform influence usage of fertilizer and seed. Moreover, since the direction of relationship between seed and fertilizer for different factors is opposite, the extent to which a factor affects the demand either seed or fertilizer depends on the sensitivities (elasticities) of both factors for the factor in question.

REFERENCES

1. Abott, J.C., 1993. Financing Fertilizer Distribution Network. In Abott, J.C. (ed). *Agricultural and Food marketing in Developing Countries*, Selected Reading, U.K. CTA International Publication.
2. Akinola, A.A. and T. Young, 1991. Application of the Tobit Model in the Analysis of Agricultural Innovations Adopted Process: A Study of the Use of Cocoa Spraying Chemical Among Cocoa Farmers: In *Agricultural Systems*, 36: 36-26-51.
3. Nwagbo, E.C. and F.O. Achoja, 2001. Correlates of Sustainable Fertilizer Consumption Among Smallholder Farmers: An Econometric Approach. A paper presented at the Annual conference of Nigeria Association of Agricultural Economists at the University of Nigeria Nsukka 11-13th June.
4. F.A.O., 2009. *New Light on a Hidden Treasure: International Year of the Potato 2008*. An end of year review. FAO. Rome.
5. NSO, 2005. *Integrated Household Survey*, National Statistical Office, Zomba.
6. GoM, Government of Malawi, 2007. *Economic report*. Ministry of economic planning and development, Lilongwe, Malawi.
7. Chianu, J.N., O.I.Y. Ajani and J.N. Chianu, 2008. Livelihoods and rural wealth distribution among farm households in western Kenya: Implications for rural development, poverty alleviation interventions and peace. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3(7): 455-464.
8. Glendenning, C.J., S. Babu and K. Asenso-Okyere, 2010. *Review of Agricultural Extension in India: Are Farmers' Information Needs Being Met?* IFPRI Discussion Paper 01048.
9. Delgado, C.L., 1997. *Africa's changing agricultural development strategies*. 2020 Brief 42. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
10. Kelly, V., 2005. *Farmers' Demand for Fertilizer in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Michigan State University, East Lansing.
11. Adesina, A.A., 1996. Factors affecting the adoption of fertilizers of rice farmers in cored'ivoire. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst.*, 46: 29-39.
12. Marenya, P.P. and C.B. Barrett, 2009. Soil quality and fertilizer use rates among smallholder farmers in western Kenya. *Agricultural Economics*, 40(5): 561-572.
13. Langyintuo, A.S. and C. Mungoma, 2008. The effect of household wealth on the adoption of improved maize varieties in Zambia. *Food PoZig*, 33: 550-559.
14. Lopez, R.E., 1986. Structural Models of the Farm Household that Allow for Interdependent Utility and Profit Maximization Decisions, In: L. Singh, L. Squire, J. Strauss (ed). *Agricultural Household Models*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, pp: 306-325.
15. Binswanger, H.P., 1974. A Cost Function Approach to the Measurement of Elasticities of Factor Demand and Elasticities of Substitution. *Amer. J. Agric. Econ.*, 56: 377-386.
16. Greene, W.H., 2000. *Econometric Analysis*, 4th ed., Prentice Hall, pp: 640-642.
17. Obare, G.A., S.W. Omamo and J.C. Williams, 2003. Smallholder Production Structure and Rural Roads in Africa: The Case of Nakuru District, Kenya, *Agric. Econ.*, 28: 245-254.
18. Dalton, T.J., W.A. Masters and K.A. Foster, 1997. Production Costs and Input Substitution in Zimbabwe's Smallholder Agriculture, *Agric. Econ.*, 17: 201-209.
19. Government of Malawi, 2002. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning. Lilongwe, Malawi.
20. Breusch, T.S. and A.R. Pagan, 1979. A Simple Test for Heteroskedasticity and Random Coefficient Variation, *Econometrica*, 50: 987-1007.
21. Pindyck, R.S. and D. Rubinfeld, 1981. *Econometric models and economic forecasts*. New York: McGraw Hill.
22. Edriss, A.K., 2003. *A Passport to Research Methods*. Las Vegas; International Publishers and Press.

23. Njiwa, D., 2007. Assessment of Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Investments in Soil Fertility Improvement in Smallholder Flood Plane Rice Value Chains. The Case of Bua and Kasitu Rice Schemes in Nkhotakota Rural Development projects in Malawi. Univeristy of Malawi. Unpublished M.Sc.Thesis. Malawi.
24. Croppenstedt, A. and M. Demeke, 1996. Determinants of adoption and Levels of Demand for Fertilizer for Cereal Growing Farmers in Ethiopia. Working Paper No. 96-3. Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University. Oxford.
25. Olwande, J.N.M. and W. Nguyo, 2009. Supply Responsiveness of Maize Farmers In Kenya: A Farm-Level Analysis. Kenya.