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Introduction

• Measuring agric productivity changes and identifying causes is difficult
  – Survey-data – 1 year, no panel
  – Time series only aggregate data
  – Cross-country comparisons use different samples

• We use three sets of productivity indicators to get comprehensive picture
Productivity indicators

• Partial productivity 1: LABOR productivity

• Partial productivity 2: YIELDS (land & animal productivity)

• Total factor productivity (TFP):
  – Evolution of output-input ratio
Resource endowments, reforms and technical change in transition countries

• Resource endowments play important role in agricultural productivity growth
• Induced innovations in technology biased towards saving the limiting factor
• Labor abundant & land scarce $\rightarrow$ technology innovations to use land more efficiently
  $\rightarrow$ biological innovations
• Land abundant & labor scarce $\rightarrow$ technology innovations to use labor more efficiently
  $\rightarrow$ mechanical innovations
  $\rightarrow$ adjustment in land labor ratio
Resource endowments, reforms and technical change in transition countries

• Major differences in resource endowments and nature of technology in transition countries
## Resource endowments, reforms and technical change in transition countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share of agr. in empl (%)</th>
<th>Labor/land ratio</th>
<th>Agr. land in ind. farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Asia</strong></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkmenista</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caucasus</strong></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European CIS</strong></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baltics</strong></td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Europe</strong></td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balkans</strong></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource endowments, reforms and technical change in transition countries

• But impact resource endowments on productivity growth complex because
  – Pre-reform distortions in factor and output prices → removal affects factor adjustments
  – Factor adjustments are conditional on progress in reform process
    • Affected also access to credit for investment in machinery and working capital
  – Government policies and level of development affect opportunity cost of labor and hence factor adjustments
  – Endogenous adjustments of farm restructuring
Changes in Agricultural Labor Productivity
(output per farm worker – ALP)
Changes in Labor Use

![Line chart showing changes in labor use across different regions from 1989/1990 to 2007/2008. The regions include Central Europe, Balkan, Baltics, European CIS, Caucasus, and Central Asian NIS. The y-axis represents labor input, and the x-axis represents years from 1989/1990 to 2007/2008. Each region has a unique line color and marker style.]
Change in Land/Labor ratio
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Change in average agricultural yields 
(grains, sugar beet and milk )

Agricultural yield index is calculated as the average yield index of grains, sugar beet and milk. Given the sensitivity of grain yields to the weather conditions, the figures show the moving average over three years. Balkans includes Albania, Bulgaria, Romania and excludes Slovenia.
Methodology TFP

• Growth accounting approach
• Account for growth in output by measuring factor inputs and an unexplained residual, which is generally attributed to technological change
• TFP is measured as an output-input ratio where the estimated coefficients of the different production factors in a Cobb-Douglas production function are used as inputs weights
• As input weights, we used the coefficients of the production function estimated in Cungu & Swinnen (2003)
Total factor productivity change
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## Total factor productivity change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European CIS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology and the Nature of Productivity Gains

- Gains in productivity have come both from property rights reforms and organizational restructuring,
- But: the relative importance of each component differs between countries reflecting technology.
- In labor-intensive regions: shift from large-scale collective farming to small-scale individual farming caused dramatic gains in productivity with relatively small losses in scale efficiency.
- In capital and land intensive regions, gains in labor productivity, if any, came primarily from large farms shedding labor with privatization of the farms.
Labor intensity and the shift to individual farming

![Chart showing the relationship between pre-reform labor intensity and individual farming 5 years after reform, with data points for Balkan, Caucasus, Central Eur, Core CIS, and China.]
Patterns of Restructuring

• In **labor intensive** nations
  e.g., Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan,…
  Gains from property rights came with shift to individual farming

• In **land intensive** nations
  e.g., Czech, Slovakia, Hungary, …
  Gains in productivity primarily from labor shedding on large private farms
Technology and the Nature of Productivity Gains

• In labor-intensive regions: shift to small-scale individual farming caused dramatic gains in efficiency

• In capital and land intensive regions, gains in productivity came from large farms shedding labour

=> Labor adjustment is jointly endogenous with farm restructuring
Initial farm structure and labor adjustment in Poland
Technology, Productivity & Policy

• **In labor-intensive regions**: shift to small-scale individual farming caused dramatic gains in efficiency

  => Conditional on land policy
Productivity gains only start after in-kind distribution of land

Immediately:

- Albania 1991
- Armenia 1992

After first trying the Russian (shares) approach:

- Georgia 1992
- Kyrgyz Rep 1995
- Azerbaijan 1996
- Moldova 1998
- ... ALL LABOR INTENSIVE AGRIC ECONOMIES
Technology, Productivity & Policy

• **In labor-intensive regions**: shift to small-scale individual farming caused dramatic gains in efficiency
  
  => Conditional on land policy

• **In capital and land intensive regions**, gains in productivity came from large farms shedding labor
  
  => Conditional on farm policy: hard vs soft budget constraints (CE vs Core CIS)
Conclusions

• Dramatic changes in productivity

• Generally: J (or U) effect
  – Some exceptions (pos, neg)

• Depth and length of initial decline differs
  – Most advanced reforms: milder decline and faster recovery.
  – Least advanced reformers: steeper decline and slower recovery
Conclusions

• Nature of the (initial) productivity gains differs
  - Most economic advanced Central European Countries
    • Initial resource endowment: labor extensive countries
    • Restitution of land: consolidation of land in large scale enterprises
    • Large outflow of labor ➔ strong increases in ALP drives productivity growth
    • Inflow of FDI and vertically coordinated supply chains e.g. Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia
    • But Latvia & Estonia: very strong decline in output ➔ slow recovery of TFP
      - longer period under central planning: institutional environment less suited to serve individual farms
      - disruption of supply chain
Conclusions

• Nature of the (initial) productivity gains differs
  – Less economic advanced Central and East European Countries
    • Initial resource endowment: more labor intensive countries
    • Restitution of land: older persons enter farming to complement pensions
    • Initially limited outflow of labor: agriculture was social buffer
    • Large decline in output and productivity, but from beginning of the 2000s recovery due to shedding of labor and inflow of FDI
  e.g. Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Lithuania
Conclusions

• Nature of the (initial) productivity gains differs
  - Low income countries in FSU
    • Initial resource endowment: labor intensive countries
    • Initially land shares distribution, physical plots later on
    • Initially large inflow of labor due to shift towards individual farming
    • Increase importance labor intensive sectors
    • Large decline in output and labor productivity, but increase in yields
      e.g. Armenia, Azerbaijan, …
Conclusions

• Nature of the (initial) productivity gains differs
  – Middle income countries in FSU
    • Initial resource endowment: land intensive countries
    • Slow implementation of reforms which still favor large scale farms (threshold reforms not yet)
    • Initially no outflow of labor
    • Large decline in output and productivity
    • Recently decline in agricultural employment and increasing investments due to macroeconomic improvements
  e.g. Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, …
Conclusions

• Drivers of productivity gains change over time. From land/farm reform to:
  - improved access to factor and output markets
  - improved options for employment outside agriculture,
  - improvements in social payments (unemployment, pensions, ...)
Conclusions

• Crucial role of reform policies

• Crucial role of initial conditions, incl:
  - technology/resource endowment
  - Institutional environment

• Interaction of initial conditions and policy choice (“endogeneity of policies”)
Appendix: Data TFP

- Output = net agricultural production index reported by FAO
- Land = arable + land under permanent crop cultivation, as reported by FAO
- Labor = number of people who are economically active in agriculture including those that are either engaged or seeking employment in agriculture, as reported by national statistics
- Livestock = number of cattle indicated as the number of live animal heads in a country at the time of enumeration, as reported by FAO
- Capital = physical number of tractors, as reported by FAO
- Fertilizer = quantity of pure nutrient fertilizer in metric tones consumed in agriculture, as reported by FAO
Figures ALP, GAO/Land, Land/Labor, TFP
Figures ALP, GAO/Land, Land/Labor, TFP
Figures ALP, GAO/Land, Land/Labor, TFP
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