

THE IMPACT OF WATER PRODUCTIVITY ON PRODUCTION FUNCTION OF CANOLA IN IRAN

Fateme Taei Samirumi*

Javad Shahraki**

Mohammad Nabi Shahiki Tash**

Abstract

The resources scarcity have always been of the critical limitations in production process, hence to create a favorable life, the human have no choice but to better use of existing facilities to produce more and with higher quality. The water is considered as most important factor in agricultural crops production. The aim of this research is to investigate the impact of water productivity on production function of canola in all Iran's provinces during 2005-2010 using panel data model. The results suggest that the water productivity has positive effect on production, that is, if the water productivity grows by 1 percent the production will increase by 65 percent. Also with growth of water intensity by 1 percent the production will increase by 64 percent. Thus, considering the effects of water productivity on the welfare of canola producers we can consider the policy of water productivity improvement as one of the appropriate economic policies for Iran's agricultural sector.

* M.A Student in Agriculture Economics, University of Sistan and Baluchestan

** Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Sistan and Baluchestan

1-Introduction

Due to low rainfall and its inappropriate temporal and locative distribution, Iran is considered among the arid and semiarid countries. Iran, on the other hand, due to the population growth, health development and expansion of agricultural and industrial sectors and such these cases is faced with the increasing water demand and this will lead to creating the gap between demand and supply of this valuable factor in the future. Increasing this gap, make it inevitable to serious attention to fundamentals of economic planning of water resources and its optimal allocation. Studies and surveys show that currently from country's total renewable water resources about 89.5 billion cubic meters is harvested for agriculture, industry, mining and household uses which of if amount the agricultural sector accounts for about 83 billion cubic meters (93 percent), the household sector accounts for 5.5 billion cubic meters (6 percent) and the rest is belonged to industry sector and other miscellaneous needs. Despite the limitation of water resources and its inappropriate locative distribution, unfortunately, the productivity and efficiency of utilization of these resources is very low. Analysis of indicators of water use in the agricultural sector represents a high water losses in this sector which a part of it is negligible, but a large part of it can be corrected by adopting a correct and efficient strategies (Ehsani and Khaledi, 2003). The food security depends on increasing agricultural production against increasing the food demand due to population growth. Increasing the agricultural production, on the other hand, is facing with serious constraints on water supply. The only way to respond to the increasing demand for food is optimal utilization of extracted water resources for agriculture and more production in exchange for less water consumption. Of course, controlling the losses in the production process and consumption of agricultural products should also be considered (Ommani and Khalili Esnaki, 2011).

Human economic effort has always been to get the maximum results from minimum attempts, this tendency can be considered as a way to achieve higher productivity. The water is known as a key parameter in agriculture, so, its productivity whether in micro level or macro level is interest of economic experts in terms of economic and policy making logic.

Today, due to population growth, resources scarcity and expansion of competition in global markets, the optimal and efficient use of resources and, in fact, increasing the productivity of resources have great importance. Since the agricultural sector is one of the important sectors in

every country's economics accounting for a large amounts of water usage, and, given that the growth in production of the agricultural sector could have a significant role in economic growth, thus improving water productivity is important in this sector.

2-Literature Review

MajdeSalimi et al. (2006) studied the impact of various periods of sprinkler irrigation on water productivity and qualitative characteristics of tea plant and also its economic assessment over a three years period (2002 to 2004) in tea research station of Fooman (Guilan province). The results of economic assessment indicated that the mean of income to cost ratio for treatments of irrigation period of 4 to 16 days and control is equal to 2, 1.64, 1.74, 1.43 and 1.5, respectively.

Sepahvand (2009) compared the water demand, water productivity and economic productivity for wheat and canola in the west of Iran during 2001-2002 (rainy year) in research station of SarabChangaei (Lorestan province). The results of his study suggested that the difference of mean total water consumption, water productivity and water economic productivity of two plants is significant at 1 percent significant level.

In order to check the impact of planting distance and irrigation management on water productivity in the Gilan province, Amiri et al. (2011) performed an experiment in the framework of split plots based on randomized complete block plan in three replications during two crop years of 2001 and 2002 at the Rice Research Institute (in Rasht). According to their results, they selected 75 percent of evaporation from the level of evaporation washbasin and planting distance of 20*20 cm as the best irrigation management and planting distance.

In order to examine the effect of deficit irrigation on water yield and productivity of seven cultivars of soybean, Aminifar (2011) conducted an experiment as split plots in a randomized complete block design with three replications at the Research Farm of Faculty of Agriculture of University of Guilan. The results showed that with decreasing irrigation the grain yield significantly decreases, so that maximum grain yield in treatment increases by 13 and 33 percent, respectively.

Shah and Dalwadi (2010) critically evaluated their irrigation command and water productivity based on satellite remote sensing. Their study showed that the remote sensing is based on

estimation of water consumption and water stress along with secondary data for production and profit.

Abdul- Ganiy et al. (2012) evaluated the usage and productivity of agronomic water for production of bell peppers in the northern region of Ghana. Their results showed that the pepper needs 545.5 cubic mm water to growth and maturation. On average, the yield of fresh pepper was 7.3 tons per hectare while the water productivity was 1.33 kg. They suggest that use of effective water with appropriate irrigation program would be appropriate for improving irrigation performance.

3-Model introduction and results description

1-3-Solow residual model

The Solow residual is nothing but subtracting the weighted average of factors growth from output growth. This can be restated mathematically as

$$LN TFP = \ln r - \alpha \ln k - \beta \ln l$$

In other words, that part of output growth which cannot be explained by quantitative growth of labor and capital is attributable to total factor productivity growth.

2-3-Solow model

In this model, a production function is defined. To calculate total factor productivity growth, Solow suggests functions of the form of Cobb-Douglas that its general form is as follow:

$$V = A K^{\beta} L^{\alpha}$$

Where, A is the technology parameter. With regard to existence of constant returns to scale and satisfying the condition $\alpha + \beta = 1$, then the production function has only one parameter. By dividing both sides of the Cobb-Douglas function on L (number of employees) and perform a series of mathematical operations, the following equation is obtained of which we can calculate the LNA that is the technology growth or, in other words, the growth of total factor productivity growth.

$$LN P_t = LNA + B \ln k$$

Where, P_l indicates the average labor productivity growth, LNA is total factor productivity growth, LNK is capital intensity growth. The capital intensity is obtained from value of fixed capital inventory divided by the number of employees, K/L. If the two sides of Cobb-Douglas function is divided into k (the value of capital inventory), after performing the mathematical operations we will achieve the following equation

$$LNP_K = LNA + (\beta - 1) * LNK$$

As can be seen we can calculate total productivity growth (LNA) using labor productivity growth or capital productivity growth and capital intensity growth and the coefficient of production elasticity with respect to labor factor (β)

3-3-Contribution of TFP growth to output growth

In the fourth development plan the contribution of TFP growth to value added growth has been determined for each economic sector and the whole country using the Solow residual model. In this research the total factor productivity is considered as the resultant of changes in labor and capital productivity. This mathematically is as follows:

$$LNTFP = \alpha LNAP_K + \beta LNAP_L$$

That is, total factor productivity growth (LNTFP) is equal to the weighted average of capital productivity growth rate ($LNAP_K$) and labor productivity growth rate ($LNAP_L$). In other words, that part of output growth which cannot be explained by growth of labor and capital is attributable to total factor productivity growth, namely:

$$LNTFP = LNY - \alpha LNK - \beta LNL$$

If the first equation is substituted in the second relation, given that the production elasticity of capital and labor is α and β , respectively, the following equation is obtained:

$$Lny = \alpha \ln k + \beta \ln l + \alpha \ln AP_K + \beta \ln AP_L$$

This relationship separates the output growth into two parts: the two first terms in the right hand side of equation represent the share of increased use of manpower and capital in the output growth, and the latter two terms are related to contribution of total factor productivity to output growth. This relationship can be extended to more than two inputs (National Productivity Centre, 2006).

$$LNY = \alpha LNK + \beta LNL + \dots + \mu LNE + \alpha \ln AP_K + \beta \ln AP_L + \dots + \mu \ln AP_\mu$$

4-3-Data and model variables

The data used in analysis is collected from the information of 13 provinces during 2005 to 2010. The estimation method is therefore panel data model. The variables used in the model include the yield per hectare as dependent variable and independent variables include the water (in liters), labor force (in person- Labor Day) and fertilizers and pesticides in kilograms. The data are collected from the site of ministry of agriculture and statistics related to the census of the costs of agricultural crops production.

5-3-Estimation of the Solow residual growth model and the interpretation of results

The function used in estimation of Solow residual model is the Cobb-Douglas function. The reason of application of this function instead of other functions is that: firstly, Solow has recommended the Cobb-Douglas function to calculate total factor productivity. Secondly, studies conducted inside the country indicate that this function is suitable for estimating the total productivity and economic growth. Thirdly, due to its feature it is possible to substitute the factors in production flow and also its functional form is suitable. Before estimating the model, the two tests of F-Limer and Hausman is examined. The F-Limer test is applied to recognize whether the model estimated using OLS method (pooling data) or panel data model. The null hypothesis in this test is that the cross-sections are homogeneous (pooling data) and the alternative hypothesis is homogeneity among cross-sections (panel data). The results of table 1 reveal that the panel data model is appropriate for estimation. In panel data method we are faced with two fixed and random effects. The Hausman test is used to determine whether data have fixed or random effect. In Hausman test the null hypothesis is that the estimated error is random and the alternative hypothesis is that the effects are fixed. According to table 1 the null hypothesis is not rejected and the random effects model must be used. But, since our study is on the population, we estimate the model by fixed effect model.

Table 1: The results of F-Limer test and Hausman test for Solow growth model

Test	Test statistic	prob	Result
F-Limer	F=2.4483	.0215	Estimation with panel data method
Hausman	$\chi^2=2.3951$.9664	Estimation with random effects but since whole population has been considered, the model is estimated by fixed effects method.

Table 2: The results of the Solow residual growth model estimation

Variables	coefficients	Standard deviation	T	Significant level
C	1.992**	.0797	24.999	0.000
LNAPW	.656**	.0617	10.645	0.000
LNAPL	.076**	.0161	4.762	0.000
LNAPF	.236**	.0628	3.769	0.000
LNAPP	.019	.0174	1.060	0.297
LNW	.649**	.0626	10.371	0.000
LNL	.049**	.0098	5.059	0.000
LNF	.118**	.0355	3.322	0.002
LNP	.019*	.0099	1.938	0.0615
AR(1)	-.0839	.0824	-1.0198	0.3154
R ² =.99	N=54	DW=2.27	F=3327.57	

Source: research findings

* Significant level of 95%

** Significant level of 99%

According to table 2, it is seen that the sign of all estimated coefficients is positive except the coefficient of AR (1) which are consistent with theoretical expectations. Also the estimated coefficients are statistically significant in significant levels of 95% and 99%. According to R² and F statistics the explanatory power of the model is high and the amount of Durbin-Watson statistic

indicate that there is no autocorrelation problem in the model. Considering that the Solow growth model is estimated in logarithmic form, the sum of the estimated coefficients corresponding to each of the inputs shows, in fact, the partial elasticity of production with respect to each of the production factors. In our model the sum of estimated coefficients is greater than unit and equal to 3.2256 indicates the increasing returns to scale.

6-3-Interpretation of the Solow growth model coefficients

According to table 2 the coefficient of water productivity growth (LNAPW) is positive and equal to 0.66 which has a significant role in output growth. Also, this coefficient implies that a one percent increase in water productivity growth leads to increase in output growth by 66 percent. The coefficient of labor productivity growth (LNAPL) is equal to 0.07 which is positive and statistically significant. This coefficient implies that a one percent increase in labor productivity growth cause the output growth increase by 7 percent.

The coefficient of fertilizer productivity growth (LNAPF) is equal to 0.24 which is positive and has significant effect on output growth. This coefficient indicates that if the fertilizer productivity growth increase by one percent the output growth will increase by 24 percent. Also the coefficient of pesticide productivity growth (LNAPP) is equal to 0.02 which is positive and statistically is not significant and has no significant effect on production. According to the results of previous estimations the marginal productivity of pesticide is negative and this is due to entry of this input into third region of production, which increases the cost of production. So, in order to increase the production the consumption of this input should be decreased and its positive and insignificant coefficient may be due to the same fact that it has been currently placed in third region of production.

The coefficient of water (LNW) is equal to 0.65 which is significant and indicates that a one percent increase in water used increase the output growth by 65 percent. The coefficient of labor force (LNL) is equal to 0.05 which is positive and statistically significant and indicates that one percent increase in the number of labor force will increase the output by 5 percent. The estimated coefficient of fertilizer is equal to 0.12 which is positive and statistically significant and shows that a one percent increase in the amount of fertilizer will lead to 12 percent increase in the amount of output. The estimated coefficient of pesticide is equal to 0.02 which is positive and

significant at level of 95%. This coefficient indicates that with one percent increase of the amount of pesticide the output will increase by 2 percent.

Apart from the main results, it is worth mentioning that the coefficient of first order autoregressive term is equal to -0.08 and not statistically significant which indicates that the model do not need to autoregressive term.

4-Conclusions and Recommendations

Considering the increasing growth of population, the food security is of important issues of any country which this requires greater attention to agricultural sector. Although, the water shortage is not new problem, but it is being extended and its effect has been more destructive (Mendal, 2002). On the other hand, the available evidence suggests a critical situation of these resources in our country. Increasing the water productivity has been known as one of the solutions to this challenge. Therefore, understanding the amount of water productivity in agronomic productions is the first step in planning and management for increasing the usage of this resource. According to the results of Solow growth model estimation, the effect of water productivity on production is positive, that is if the water productivity increase by one percent the output will increase by 66 percent. Also a one percent increase in water usage will increase the output by 65 percent.

The water is one of the most important factors of countries' growth and development and shortage of drinking water on the one hand, and increasing need for food on the other hand, has faced the available water resources with a serious crisis. Middle East is among the areas which are severely faced with the problem of freshwater resources limitation. Due to the low rainfall and its inappropriate spatial and temporal distribution, Iran is among the world's arid and semi-arid countries. One of the goals of this research has been to provide guidelines and policy recommendations for improving water productivity level in the country which according to results, the following strategies can be proposed in hope of reducing water consumption.

1. More research is needed to examine the effect of water consumption on the drainage.
2. Appropriate pricing policy of inputs is a positive step in preventing the indiscriminate use of these inputs and pushing farmers to make optimum use of these inputs.

3. Improving water productivity through better crop management methods in different areas can help more to reduce water consumption.
4. Identifying the areas in which there is a less of potential agricultural performance. By proving appropriate irrigation systems the water productivity can be increased in a stable way.

References

1. Ehsani M., and Khaledi H, Agronomic Water Productivity, National Committee on Irrigation and Drainage, Tehran, winter 2003.(in Persian)
2. Ommani A R., and KhaliliEsnaki E R., Measurement ofCrop Waterproductivity of Shadravan section of Shooshtar city, researches of Agricultural promote and education, year 4, issue 35, 2011.(in Persian)
3. MajdSalimi K., Bagheri p., Salavatian, b., Influence of different irrigation periods on water productivity and quality characteristics ofthetea plantandits economicevaluationSoil and Water Journal, Volume 24, 5: 845-854, 2010 . (in Persian)
4. Sepahvand, M., comparing thewater demandandeconomic productivityof water inwheatand canola in the west of Iran in rainy years. Iranian Research Journal of Water, Third Year, Fourth Issue, pp. 63-68, 1388.(in Persian)
5. Amiri A., Razavipour D., and Bannaian M., Evaluation of water performance and productivity in rice under different irrigation management planting intervals using ORYZA2000. Electronic Journal ofagronomicplantProduction, Volume 4, Issue 3, pp. 1-19, 2011.(in Persian)
6. Aminifar J., Beigooei M H., Mohsenabadi GH R. and Samizadeh H A., The effect of deficit irrigation on water performance and productivity in seven soybean varieties in Rasht, Journalof Soil and Water, Volume 21, Number4.1390. (in Persian)
7. IranianNational Center forProductivity, Guides of Total Factor Productivity measurement in economic sectors, Managementand PlanningOrganization, 1385. (in Persian)

8. Shah, S., Dalwadi, H.J., Critical Appraisal On Irrigation Command And Water Productivity Based On SateliliteRemot Sensing, Acc, Int.J. Water Res. Enriron. Eng, PP.41-45,2010 .
9. Abdul- Ganiy U,S., Amaanatu, M.K., Korese, J.K., Crop Water Use And PropuctiVity For Pepder(Capsicum FrutEscens), Production In The BontanGa Irrigation Schewe Of Northern Region Of Ghana, International Journal Of Agricultural Science And Bioresource Engineering Research Vol.1(2), PP.43-50, Mar-Apr 2012.

