

The Environment for Development initiative is a capacity building program in environmental economics focused on international research collaboration, policy advice, and academic training. It consists of centers in Central America, China, Ethiopia, Kenya, South Africa, and Tanzania, in partnership with the Environmental Economics Unit at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden and Resources for the Future in Washington, DC. Financial support is provided by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). www.efdinitiative.org

Risk Implications of Farm Technology Adoption in the Ethiopian Highlands

Risk implications of farm technology adoption vary by technology type. If properly implemented, the safety net program and the weather insurance programs currently piloted in some parts of Ethiopia are actions that could hedge against downside risk.

By Mahmud Yesuf, Menale Kassie, and Gunnar Köhlin, MAY, 2009

In countries where insurance and credit markets are thin or missing, production and consumption risks play a critical role in the choice and use of production inputs and adoption of new farm technologies. Adoption of new farm technology could increase production risk either by increasing yield variability or increasing probabilities of crop failure. It is therefore important to fully understand the risks of farm technology adoption so as to design appropriate adoption and conservation policies and risk-hedging strategies.

Findings from Ethiopia reveal that most of the conventional inputs are

important determinants of mean output. But, these inputs (except for fertilizer inputs) are not equally important in explaining second (variance) and third moment (skewness) estimates. Fertilizer is found to be reducing yield variability but increasing the probability of crop failure. Adoption of soil and water conservation technologies is found to reduce the probability of crop failure despite having weak effect on average yield and yield variability.

Key Points

- Fertilizer adoption reduces yield variability, but increases the risk of crop failure.
- Adopting soil and water conservation technology has no impact on yield variability, but reduces the downside risk of crop failure.

Risk implication of farm technology adoption in the Ethiopian highlands

Policy implications and recommendations

This study has several important policy implications. First, the risk implications of farm technology adoption vary by technology type. For example, in the case of Ethiopian highlands, fertilizer adoption reduces yield variability, but increases downside risk; whereas soil conservation technology has no impact on yield variability, but reduces the downside risk of crop failure. Second, policies based on only the average yield and yield variability could be misleading. A production input could be risk-increasing in terms of yield variability. But, it could as well be risk increasing in terms of enhancing the probability of crop failure or downside risk. Third, policies that promote adoption of fertilizers should be complemented by strategies that hedge against downside risk. In this respect, if properly implemented, the safety net program and the weather insurance programs currently piloted in some parts of Ethiopia are actions in the right direction.

Risk implication of farm technology adoption in the Ethiopian highlands

ABOUT THIS BRIEF

This brief is based on results from: Mahmud Yesuf, Menale Kassie, and Gunnar Köhlin, 2009 "Risk Implications of Farm Technology Adoption in the Ethiopian Highlands" Discussion Paper Series, EfD DP 09-13, RFF.

REFERENCES

Antle, J.M. 1983. "Testing for Stochastic Structure of Production: A Flexible Moment-Based Approach," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 1(3): 192–201.

Antle, J.M. 1987. "Econometric Estimation of Producers' Risk Attitudes," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 69: 509–522.

Bardhan, P. 1977. "Variations in Forms of Tenancy in a Peasant Economy," *Journal of Development Economics* 4: 10–118.

Batra, R. 1974. "Resource Allocation in a General Equilibrium Model of Production under Uncertainty," *Journal of Economic Theory* 8, 50–63.

Dercon, S., and L. Christiaensen. 2007. "Consumption Risk, Technology Adoption, and Poverty Traps: Evidence from Ethiopia." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4257. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://www.ds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2007/06/15/000016406_20070615145611/Rendered/PDF/wps4257.pdf. Accessed April 2009.

Eswaran, M., and A. Kotwal. 1990. "Implications of Credit Constraints for Risk Behavior in Less Developed Economies," Oxford Economic Papers 42(2): 473–82.

Groom, B., P. Koundouri, C. Nauges, and A. Thomas. 2008. "The Story of the Moment: Risk-Averse Cypriot Farmers Respond to Drought Management," *Applied Economics* 40(3): 315–26.

Hengsdijk, H., G.W. Meijerink, and M.E. Mosugu. 2005. "Modeling the Effect of Three Soil and Water Conservation Practices in Tigray, Ethiopia," *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 105: 29–40.

Just, R., and R. Pope. 1979. "Production Function Estimation and Related Risk Considerations," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 61(2): 276–84.

Kassie, M., M. Yesuf, and G. Köhlin. 2008. "The Role of Production Risk on Sustainable Land Management Technology Adoption in the Ethiopian Highlands." Working paper. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Environmental Economics Policy Forum for Ethiopia/Ethiopian Development Research Institute.

Koundouri P., C. Nauges, and V. Tzouvelekas. 2006. "Technology Adoption under Production Uncertainty: Theory and Application to Irrigation Technology," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 8(3): 657–70.

Leathers, H.D., and J.C. Quiggin. 1991. "Interaction between Agricultural and Resource Policy: The Importance of Attitudes toward Risk." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73: 758–64.

Love, H.A., and S.T. Buccola. 1991. "Joint Risk Preference-Technology Estimation with a Primal System," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73: 765–74.

Mosley, P., and A. Verschoor. 2005. "Risk Attitudes and Vicious Circle of Poverty," *European Journal of Development Research* 17(1): 55–88.

Pandey, S. 2004. "Risk and Fertilizer Use in the Rain-Fed Rice Ecosystems of Tarlac, Philippines," *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 36(1): 341–250.

Rosegrant, M.W., and J.A. Roumasset. 1985. "The Effect of Fertilizer on Risk: A Heteroskedastic Production Function with Measurable Stochastic Inputs. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 29: 107–121.

Rosenzweig, M., and H. Binswanger. 1993. "Wealth, Weather Risk, and the Composition and Profitability of Agricultural Investments," *Economic Journal* 103(416): 56–78.

Stiglitz, J. 1974. "Incentives and Risk Sharing in Sharecropping," Review of Economic Studies 41: 219-255.

Wooldridge, J. M. 2002. Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data. Cambridge MA, USA: MIT Press.

Risk implication of farm technology adoption in the Ethiopian highlands

Yesuf, M., and R. Bluffstone. 2009, forthcoming. "Poverty, Risk Aversion, and Path Dependence in Low income Countries: Experimental Evidence from Ethiopia," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*.

CONTACT

Dr Mahmud Yesuf, mahmudyesuf@yahoo.com, tel +254 20 271993/4, (fax) +254 20 2719951;



EfD Center in Kenya, www.efdinitiative.org, Phone +254-20-2719933/4, Fax +254-20-2719951 Environment for Development in Kenya, Kenyan Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA), Bishops Garden Towers, Second Floor, Bishops Road, Box 56445-00200, Nairobi, Kenya



EfD, Environment for Development initiative, www.environmentfordevelopment.org
EfD Secretariat: info@efdinitiative.org, Phone: +46-31-786 2595, Fax +46-31-786 10 43, www.efdinitiative.org./efd-initiative/organisation/secretariat, Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg , PO Box 640, SE 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden