PN-AAN-595
ISN: 31726

THE CONSEQUENCES OF SMALL RICE FARM MECHANIZATION PROJECT

Working Paper No. 6

The Economics of Tractor Ownership and Use in the Nepal, Terai

by

Ganesh Thapa
COLLEGE OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT
University of the Philippines
Los Baños, Laguna

and

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
International Rice Research Institute
Los Baños, Laguna

October 1979

The Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization Project is supported by the United States Agency for International Development under Contract tac-1466 and Grant No. 931-1026.01 and is being implemented by the International Rice Research Institute and the Agricultural Development Council, Inc.

The Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization Project is a cross country study of the impact of engineering technologies on agricultural output, employment and income distribution. The project, a centrally funded activity of the United States Agency for International Development, has two major components. The first is a series of case studies addressing specific topics relating to the application of mechanization. The majority of the case studies are funded through awards from the Agricultural Development Council to graduate and post-graduate research personnel in the Asian region. A second component is a three country comparative study being administered by the International Rice Research Institute in cooperation with agencies in Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines. This portion of the project consists of a series of stratified cross sectional surveys and daily recordkeeping activities at sites in the above countries. Details of the field design and research methodology are contained in the operations manuals noted on the last page of this report.

Reports contained in the Working Paper Series are released without formal review or editing to facilitate communication of preliminary results and to elicit constructive comment.

Additional copies of the reports listed may be obtained by writing to:

Mechanization Consequences Project
Agricultural Engineering Department
International Rice Research Institute
P. O. Box 933
Manila, Philippines

or

The Agricultural Development Council, Inc.
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
U.S.A.

THE ECONOMICS OF TRACTOR OWNERSHIP AND USE IN THE NEPAL TERAI

by

Ganesh Thapa

Abstract

This study was designed to compare labor use, cropping intensity, percent hired labor and yields among non-mechanized and various categories of mechanized farms in the Terai Region of Nepal. In addition, the analysis examines the farmer's choice of mechanization with a risk-neutral model in which farmers are assumed to maximize the expected value of accounting profits. Farmers, representing four mechanization strata, namely tractor owning, tractor hiring, hand tractor owning and traditional bullock operated farms, were selected from Parsa and Chitwan districts for this purpose.

The results of the econometric analysis shows the statistically significant association of a high level of mechanization with high cropping intensities, high yields per hectare, high labor use (except in land preparation), a high percent of hired labor and a low labor input for the land preparation operation. Since good quality land also can lead to these results and a high shadow price for family labor and a low shadow price of capital lead to a high percentage of hired labor and also mechanization, the correlation between mechanization and these results may be partly spurious.

Two interrelated risk-neutral models in which farmers are assumed to maximize the *expected* value of accounting profits were developed and tested. The results of the tractor use model relating M (the actual mechanization indes of each farm) to M* (optimum mechanization index to achieve maximum expected profits) revealed that M* explained the actual mechanization choice of farmers with a high degree of accuracy.

THE ECONOMICS OF TRACTOR OWNERSHIP AND USE IN THE NEPAL TERAI*

By

Ganesh Thapa**

The impact of farm mechanization on labor use, cropping intensity and yield is a subject of continuing controversy in developing countries. It is generally agreed that the tractor is a highly capital intensive form of mechanization with significant potential for displacing labor. Tractorization has also been controversial in the case of Nepal, where the average size of land holding is small (1.23 ha), agricultural land is fragmented and population density is high per unit of cultivated land. Proponents of mechanization believe, however, that tractorization increases labor absorption through higher cropping intensities. It is also purported to help farmers achieve timeliness in the performance of farm operations.

The introduction of four wheel tractors and pumpsets in the mid-sixties marked the beginning of farm mechanization in Nepal. Growth of mechanization has resulted largely from the efforts of the government and government-owned corporations. Tractor population increased rapidly during the latter half of 1960s. The pattern of farm machinery is shown in Table 1. Credit to purchase this machinery was made available by the Agricultural Development Bank. These funds contributed

---

*Paper presented at a planning workshop on the Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization in Asia, International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños, Philippines, Oct. 1-4, 1979. This paper is based on the author's M. S. thesis completed under the guidance of James A. Roumasset, Chairman, Bart Duff and Tirso Paris, both members of the guidance committee.

**A/D/C Scholar at University of the Philippines. Portions of this study were conducted under a partial field support scholarship from the International Rice Research Institute.

significantly to the rapid increase in the number of tractors and pumpsets. The increasing trend in the use of farm machinery has generated a number of studies to assess the benefits and impact of farm machinery.

An earlier study on farm mechanization in the Nepal Terai reported that tractor and pumpset use increased cropping intensity, labor absorption per hectare, labor productivity and net profits.[1] Pudasaini (1976) reported that cropping intensity, yields, income and employment were higher on mechanized than traditional farms but the much greater use of cash inputs and higher education levels associated with mechanized farms made it difficult to attribute yield and income effects solely to machinery. He further observed that tractors could not be clearly linked with any on-farm labor displacement. Pumpsets were found to raise farm employment and tractor ownership allowed large farms to achieve higher cropping intensities. Similar to the experience of other countries in South Asia, tractor studies have not been *conclusive* in showing that tractors raise cropping intensity or yields, increase labor absorption or provide timeliness in the performance of farm operations.

This paper reports the findings of an econometric analysis designed to document relationships between mechanization and labor use, percent hired labor, cropping intensity and yields and to explain these relationships using the economic concept of expected profitability. It also reports the results of a decision model based on expected profit maximization to explain farmer's choice of mechanization.

---

[1] Impact of Farm Mechanization and Irrigation and Its Policy Implications: Agricultural Development Bank of Nepal, Research, Project and Planning Division, Kathmandu, Nepal, January 1973.

Characteristics of Sample Farms

Because they embody a relatively high degree of mechanization, Parsa and Chitwan districts of Nepal were selected for analysis in this study {Figs. 1 and 1 (a)}. Both districts are early adopters of mechanical technology. Four-wheel tractors are more popular in Parsa whereas Chitwan has the largest number of hand tractors in the country. According to the Agricultural Development Bank, the tractor population in Parsa in 1978 was around 200 or roughly ten percent of the total tractors in the country. Chitwan had 58 hand tractors in 1978 which is more than fourteen percent of the national hand tractor population.

Information on farm production, labor use, costs, etc. were collected through personal interviews with four categories of farmers, namely tractor owning, tractor hiring, hand tractor owning and non-mechanized bullock operators. Since tractor owning farmers are likely to own relatively large holdings compared to other types of farms, a size-adjusted sampling procedure was used. This procedure minimizes the confounding effect of farm size and makes comparison of non-mechanized and mechanized farms more meaningful.

In Parsa district, villages with high tractor populations were identified and information describing the names of farmers, land holding size, irrigation type and machine ownership were collected. Farms were listed according to farm size for three irrigation strata: pumpset irrigation, canal irrigation and rainfed. From each list, a tractor owning farm was selected at random and a tractor hiring and a bullock operated farm of the nearest farm size were also chosen. This procedure

was repeated to select 18 canal irrigated, 3 pumpset irrigated and 12 rainfed farms from each mechanization stratum. The proportion of farms in each irrigation stratum was determined on the basis of a pre-test done in the study area.

A different sampling technique was used in Chitwan district because of a lack of secondary information. Village groups with high hand tractor populations were first identified. From each village group (a village group consisted of 2 to 3 neigbouring villages) hand tractor owning farms were selected at random. Other types of farms were then chosen in the vicinity of the hand tractor owning farms. A total of 150 farms were selected and interviewed for the study.

Age, educational attainment, farm size and other selected characteristics of the sample farms are presented in Table 2 by mechanization type. Tractor owning farms are four to six times larger than farms in other categories. Tractor hiring, hand tractor owning and non-mechanized farms do not differ appreciably in this respect. Farms also differ considerably in terms of educational attainment by farmers. Tractor and hand tractor owning farmers had two to three times the number of years of schooling compared to tractor hiring and traditional farmers.

Mechanization and Patterns of Input Use

A covariance model was used to compare total labor use, labor use in specific farm operations, levels of hired labor and other inputs in rice production among non-mechanized and various categories of mechanized

farms. This method is superior to one way of analysis of variance because it incorporates corrections for differences in other factors such as irrigation, variety and farm size when comparing input use among these farms.

The following model was employed:[2]

$$L = \beta o + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta iMi + \sum_{j=1}^{2} \beta_{3+j} I_j + \beta_6 V + \beta_7 F + \sum_i \sum_j \beta_{ij} M_i I_j + \Sigma \beta_i' MV + \varepsilon \qquad (1)$$

where L = labor input in specific farm operations (mandays per hectare)

F = farm size in ha.

V = variety dummy where V = 1 for modern variety

0 otherwise

M = mechanization dummy which takes a value of unity if the farm belongs to mechanization group i where i = 1 -3.

M_1 = 1 for hand tractor owning farm, 0 otherwise

M_2 = 1 for tractor owning farm, 0 otherwise

M_3 = for tractor hiring farm, 0 otherwise

Reference group = non-mechanized farm

I = irrigation dummy which takes a value of unity if the farm belongs to j^{th} irrigation group where j = 1 - 2.

I_1 = 1 for pumpset irrigation, 0 otherwise

I_2 = for canal irrigation, 0 otherwise

Reference group = rainfed farm

---

[2]A further improvement in the model can be done by including other current inputs or prices including wage rates.

The coefficients, β_1 to β_3 measure group differences between mechanized and non-mechanized farms. β_1 indicates the additional ($\beta_1 > 0$) labor input employed by hand tractor owning farm compared to non-mechanized farms.

This model allows for non-additive effects which measure the interaction of mechanization and irrigation as well as variety on labor use. For example, β_{11} (the coefficient of $M_1 I_1$) measures the interaction of hand tractor and pumpset irrigation on the level of labor input. The significance of interaction terms was tested by fitting a constrained version of the above model (which contains no interaction terms):

$$L = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta_i M_i + \sum_{j=1}^{2} \beta_{3+j} I_j + \beta_6 \cdot v + \beta_7 \quad F + \eta \qquad (2)$$

The set of restrictions $\beta_{ij} = 0$ and $\beta_i = 0$ were tested by comparing the computed f-statistics with the tabulated f-value. The f-statistics was computed on the basis of the residuals from the estimating equations (1) and (2).

The F-tests showed that interaction effects between mechanization and irrigation as well as variety are statistically insignificant for regressions explaining variations in land preparation labor, level of fertilizer and other cash expenses.

The results of these models are presented in tables 3 - 4. Mechanized farms reported significantly lower levels of labor use for land preparation. Tractor owning, hand tractor owning and tractor hiring farms employed 15, 11 and 7 fewer mandays per hectare than non mechanized farms. In contrast,

mechanized farms reported higher levels of total hired labor and higher labor use for harvest and threshing operations compared to non-mechanized farms. Increased employment in these tasks more than balanced the lower level of labor used in land preparation on the mechanized farms. These farms reported higher total labor use by 6 to 12.5 mandays compared to bullock operated farms.

Compared to non-mechanized farms, fertilizer use on mechanized farms was higher by 10 to 28 kilograms per hectare. Higher fertilizer inputs on mechanized farms is undoubtedly a factor contributing to higher yields and increase of harvesting and threshing labor inputs on these farms.

The effect of farm size on labor use and level of other inputs such as fertilizer was negative and insignificant. Irrigation had a positive effect on labor use and the level of other inputs.

In the covariance model specified earlier, with the exception of irrigation characteristics, land quality measures such as soil fertility, topography, rainfall, etc. were not been included. If land quality and tractor use are positively correlated, the effects of omitted variables are partially captured by the estimates of the mechanization variables leading to an upward bias in these coefficients.

Mechanization and Cropping Intensity.

Comparison of average statistics shows that machine-using farms had higher cropping intensities compared to non-mechanized farms (Table 5). Hand tractor owning farms reported the highest cropping intensity (180%) followed by tractor hiring (167%) and tractor owning (150%) farms, non-

mechanized farms had a cropping intensity of 130%. Since these mean values do not segregate the effects of factors such as varieties, irrigation, and farm size from the effect of mechanization, the co-variance analysis specified earlier was used to compare cropping intensities among farms (Table 4). The results show that mechanized farms had higher cropping intensities compared to non-mechanized farms. However, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was low for the regression equation explaining differences in cropping intensity. When the number of educated adults in the family was used as a proxy for the management variable, the R^2 improved marginally and the coefficient of this variable was significant at the 20% level. The low R^2 may be due to omission of land quality measures such as soil fertility, rainfall, topography, etc. and/or inaccurate measurement of variables, including management.

Mechanization and Productivity.

Table 5 shows that mechanized farms had higher yields per hectare compared to traditional bullock operated farms. A generalized (linear lograithmic) production function with dummy variables for mechanization was estimated which allowed a comparison of productivity among non-mechanized and various categories of mechanized farms.

The production function was expressed as:

$$Y = \beta_0 F_t^{\beta_1} L^{\beta_2} C^{\beta_3} F^{\beta_4} e^{BiM_i + \beta i+j \quad I_j + \Sigma\Sigma\beta_{ij}M_iI_j + \beta_i MV + \beta' V + \varepsilon}$$

where Y = yields/ha

β_0 = intercept or efficiency term

$\sum_{i=1}^{4} \beta_i$ = partial regression coefficient of the ith input

F_t = nitrogen in kgs/ha

L = labor input in m-days/ha

C = cash inputs in Rps/ha

F = farm size in has

v = variety dummy as defined earlier

M_i = mechanization dummies as defined earlier

I_j = irrigation dummies as defined earlier

The significance of interaction terms was evaluated by using an F-test as discussed earlier.

The results of the production function model are given in Table 6. F-tests revealed that the interaction terms were again insignificant.

Fertilizer and cash expenses have positive partial elasticities, i.e., a one percent increase in any of these inputs would result in an increase in yield by a percentage equivalent to the partial elasticity for that particular input. The coefficient of irrigation and variety are also positive and significant. Labor has a positive partial elasticity.

Farm size was negatively associated with yields. Other studies have shown an inverse relationship between farm size and productivity, particularly for family farms. Small family farms usually have better land quality and low shadow price[2] for family labor. For commercial farms,

---

[2] The Shadow Price is the opportunity cost of an input when employed in alternative uses.

however, farm size is often positively correlated with yields per hectare (Uy, 1979). Large farms may mechanization because of economies of scale in the operation of machinery. This helps reconcile the finding that larger, mechanized farms have higher yields per hectare with inverse relationship between farm size and productivity.

Explaining Tractor Use: Expected Profit Maximization.

Decision models based on expected profit maximization were developed and tested to predict tractor ownership and explain the observed choice of mechanization by individual farmers. The basic approach was first developed by Roumasset (1973, 1976) to explain fertilizer use by Filipino farmers and the methodology was further simplified to improve its applicability (Roumasset, 1978). In this model, the returns to different production techniques under three states of nature (good, medium and bad seasons) are estimated and an optimal rate of input use which maximizes expected profits is predicted for each farm. A second step is to measure how well the *predicted* level of input use explains the *actual* inputs used by farmers.

Two extensions were developed in order to apply the expected profit approach to the mechanization problem. First, since it is difficult to quantify and measure mechanical power used in farm tasks, a mechanization index based on horsepower-hours per hectare was developed. The procedure for computing the index is shown in Table 8. Secondly, an attempt was made to link the long-term investment decision with the short-term production decision. Roumasset's (1976) earlier use of the model dealt with a production process which was independent of the investment decision.

According to neo-classical economic theory, with perfect rental markets for capital goods, investment and production decisions are independent. In less than a perfect market, these decisions are no longer independent. Since mechanization is a key part of farm investment, two interrelated models were developed to link the investment decision with the production decision.

Risk preferences were omitted for two reasons: A previous test of the model (Roumasset, 1973; 1976) suggested that risk preferences do not help explain actual input use. Furthermore, due to the necessary level of approximation in estimating a stochastic production function, the inclusion of risk preferences would only be a minor refinement.

The Tractor Use Model. In explaining tractor use, we assume farmers wish to maximize expected accounting profits. For our purpose, six production techniques were defined on the basis of varying levels of inputs used in the production process. Tractor owning, tractor hiring and bullock operated farms were each assumed to employ two production techniques based on the level of fertilizer used.

A group of farmers and experts in each village were asked about the level of inputs used and the expected yields under each production technique for three states of nature: good, medium and bad. These states refer to no damage, moderate damage, and major damage to crops caused by pest and weather problems. By asking how many years out of ten the farmer expected the season to be good, medium or bad, expected

yields corresponding to the three states of nature could be computed. In each village, farmers were stratified into three economic groups on the basis of soil type, variety grown, irrigation availability and mechanization level.

In order to determine expected accounting profits corresponding to each production technique, opportunity costs and shadow prices were used instead of market prices.

For tractor owners and hirers, who usually have large farms and employ a high degree of hired labor, the hired wage rate was taken as the shadow price of labor. The wage a farmer must pay to hired labor and the wage that family members earn outside differ if transportation costs are taken into account. Therefore, in the case of bullock operated farms where the family prepares the land, the shadow price for labor in land preparation was assumed to be eighty percent of the wage rate, a figure believed to fall between the buying and selling price for labor in the market.

Since farmers would have to borrow from money lenders for additional expenditures at roughly 25 percent per year, this figure was taken as the shadow price of capital. This is the cost to the farmer of borrowing an additional Rupee at the margin. Since the output price (rice) fluctuates every year, an average price was computed by assigning weights (0.4, 0.3 and 0.2) to the price of three preceeding years. This average price was assumed to be the shadow price of output.

The expected profit maximizing levels of mechanization (M_1* and M_2*) were computed for each farm group (which included sample farms from each village). M_1* is the mechanization index corresponding to a production technique who maximizes expected profits in a tractor *owning* farm. In Table 7, since production technique A has higher expected profits than technique B, and both correspond to tractor owning category, mechanization index (0.8920) corresponding to technique A is M_1*.

M_2* is the mechanization index corresponding to a production technique that maximizes expected profits or a tractor *hiring* farm. Since technique D has higher expected profits than technique C, and both techniques correspond to tractor hiring category, the mechanization index (0.8309) corresponding to technique D is M_2*.

<u>The Tractor Ownership Decision Model.</u> In an ordinary investment model, the sum of net present value of benefits forms the basis for the investment decision. This model can not be used independently to predict tractor ownership by Nepalese farmers because the Agricultural Development Bank, which is the source of tractor loans, also influences ownership decisions. Ownership depends on two separate decisions. The farmer has to buy a tractor on the basis of economic returns he expects to obtain from ownership of the machine. In addition, however, the bank must choose farmers who meet their basic requirements for tractor ownership. (All tractor owners in the sample area obtained their tractors A.D.B. loans). In order to predict tractor ownership in Nepal, we need to model both the demand and supply sides which are represented by farmers and the bank respectively.

<u>The Model.</u> The farmer will own a tractor if:

i) the sum of the present value of net benefits from ownership of tractor is positive, and

ii) the farmer can meet the bank requirement for a tractor loan.

<u>Net Benefits.</u> The benefits of a tractor ownership comprise the sum of net rents obtained from use of the tractor on the family's own farm, the sum of net rents obtained by hiring out to others and the sum of differences in expected profits between tractor owning and tractor hiring farm

The present value of net benefits was computed by subtracting discounted costs from discounted benefits for each tractor owning, tractor hiring and bullock operated farm included in the sample. For tractor owning farms, the actual hours of tractor use and actual costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of tractor were computed in calculating net benefits. Net benefits from tractor ownership in the case of tractor hiring and bullock operated farms were computed on the assumption that if they owned tractors, they would use an average number of hours of tractor services and would *hire* out the tractors an average number of hours annually. These average figures were computed from the actual hours of tractor use by the tractor owners.

The annual sum of net rents on the farmer's own farm was computed by multiplying the total number of hours of tractor use on the farm and in transporting inputs and produce by the per unit net rental charge. The annual sum of net rents from tractor use on other's farms was computed by multiplying the total number of hours the tractor was hired

out by the contract rate. In summing the net rents over the years, it was assumed that net rents would be identical for each year.

For those hiring tractors, the actual hiring rate (Rupees 45 per hour) was taken as the shadow price or net rental rate for tractor use. Since a tractor owner includes a profit margin and price for the risk of breakdown in the rental rate, the shadow price of tractor use for owners will be less than the actual hiring rate. Based on these criteria, the shadow price for tractor use by tractor owners was assumed to be twenty percent less than the actual hiring rate.

The difference in expected profits between a tractor owning and a tractor hiring farm is the benefit attributable to tractor ownership. The computation of expected profits in tractor owning and tractor hiring farms is shown in Table 7. Tractor owning farms have two production techniques (A and B) and two techniques are defined for tractor hiring farms (C and D). In the example given in Table 7, technique A generates the highest expected profit (Rupees 797 per hectare) in the tractor owning category while technique D yielded the highest expected profit (Rupees 689 per ha) in the tractor hiring category. The difference in expected profits (Rupees 106.61 per hectare per crop) is a benefit attributable to tractor ownership. In computing the sum of the differences in expected profits over 10 years (life of the tractor) it was assumed farmers would obtain identical expected profits from two crops grown each year and the profits would not vary over the years for which the sum is computed.

Costs. The costs incurred by a tractor owner are: (a) fixed costs which include depreciation, taxes and insurance, interest on investment and labor costs, (b) variable costs which include expenditures on diesel, lubricants, oils, repairs and maintenance costs. These costs were computed on the basis of total hours of tractor use. The assumptions and procedures for the computation of these costs are presented in Table 9.

Agricultural Development Bank Requirements: Farmers need to fulfill 3 basic requirements set by the Agricultural Development Bank to obtain a tractor loan:

(1) the farmer should own at least 10 hectares of land, although if he owns only 3.35 ha of land, he can apply for a tractor loan if other members of his family own additional land which can be used to make up the deficit.

(2) the farmer should be able to utilize the tractor for at least 750 hours annually.

(3) the applicant should be able to deposit in cash at least 15 percent of the tractor price with the bank and mortgage his land as security against the remainder of the loan.

The ability of a farmer to utilize the tractor for the recommended number of hours depends on the size of his farm and the prospects of hiring out the tractor to other farmers. The number of hours of tractor use on a farmer's own farm is computed on the basis of actual size for each farm. The number of hours that a prospective tractor expects to hire out his tractor was based on the average number of hours actual owners

are currently hiring out tractors. To determine if the sample farms satisfied the third requirement set by the bank, a cash balance was computed for each farm by subtracting total annual costs from total annual revenue. A farm which has a positive sum of discounted benefits and which meets all the requirements set by the bank was predicted to own a tractor. A schematic diagram of the model is shown in Fig. 2.

Findings of the Ownership Model. The present value of net benefits was computed for all tractor owning (33), tractor hiring (33) and bullock operated (33) farms in the sample. Out of a total 33 tractor owning farms, 26 had positive net benefits. For the remaining 7 farms, gross costs were greater than gross benefits.

Among tractor hiring farms, only 2 had positive net benefits. None of the bullock operated showed a positive benefit. Tractor owning farms showing negative net benefits utilized tractors less than the recommended annual number of hours, either because of small holdings or inability to hire out the tractor to others. Most of the tractor hiring and bullock operated farms had negative net benefits because of small holdings.

Whereas all tractor owning farms met the minimum land area requirement set by the bank, four utilized their tractors less than the required number of hours annually. As a result, these farms had negative net benefits. All tractor owning farms, however, had sufficient cash to deposit at least 15 percent of the tractor price with the bank upon approval of the tractor loan.

Only 18 to 33 tractor hiring farms and 9 of 33 bullock operated farms possessed the minimum farm area required by the bank. In addition, only 4 tractor hiring farms had sufficient cash on hand to meet the required bank deposit. Two of these 4 tractor hiring farms had positive net benefits. None of the bullock operated farms had adequate cash for the bank deposit.

Out of 33 tractor owning farms, the model predicted 26 farms would buy tractors, would have positive net benefits and would meet all requirements set by the bank. The model predicted that only two of 33 tractor hiring and none of the bullock operated farms would own tractors. Based on these results, we can conclude that the model is 91 percent accurate in predicting tractor ownership by farmers in the Nepal Terai.

The Complete Model. The tractor ownership decision model makes use of expected profits computed for various farm types under different production techniques to predict tractor ownership. It is then possible to determine the implicit net rent of tractor use for each farm. The tractor use model employs this information in conjunction with the prices of other inputs and predicts tractor use. In testing this model, we compute an actual mechanization index M, and the mechanization inde M* corresponding to the maximum level of expected profits. We then test the power of M* to explain the actual mechanization level, M.

Power of M* in Explaining M. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was computed by relating M to M* for all farms in the sample. It was assumed that there is no learning lag among farmers, there are no omitted variables and there exists a one-to-one relation between M and M*. Therefore, in the estimating relationship, M is replaced by M* and R^2 is given by:

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{(M-M^*)^2}{(M-\bar{M})^2}$$

computed R^2 = 0.91 when intercept, a = 0 and slope, b = 1

The high coefficient of determination (R^2) shows that M* explains the actual mechanization choice of the farmer very well.

Linear Regression of M on M*. In order to test the possible significance of a learning lag among farmers and omitted variables, the actual mechanization index M computed for each farm, was regressed on M* by assuming that there exists the a learning lag and the effects of omitted variables which can be represented by the intercept term in the regression. It was also assumed that a change in M* does not result in an equal change in M, i.e. the regression coefficient is not equal to unity.

R^2 was computed as:

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{(M-\hat{M})^2}{(M-\bar{M})^2}$$

The results of the regression are as follows:

Regression	Intercept	Regression coefficient	R^2
M or M*	0.0137	0.9898 (30.78)	0.91

The regression coefficient is close to unity and the intercept is very low which supports our earlier assumptions. Farmers do not have a substantial learning lag, i. e. they are quickly aware of the benefits of tractors. Thus, the extent of mechanization is accurately predicted by a risk-neutral model wherein farmers are assumed to maximize the expected value of accounting profits.

SUMMARY

The results of the econometric analysis revealed that mechanized farms had higher cropping intensities, higher yields per hectare, higher levels of labor use (except in land preparation), a higher percentage of hired labor and lower levels of labor in land preparation compared to non-mechanized farms. However, the regression estimates may exhibit bias because of omitted explanatory variables such as a measure of land quality (soil fertility, topography, etc.) and/or inaccurate measurement of variables. Considering the deficiencies in the data that mechanized farms use higher levels of inputs, the analysis is inadequate to conclude that the above results are solely a result of using machinery. We can only say that a high level of mechanization is normally associated with these findings.

Other studies have shown that good land quality leads to more intensive crop cultivation, i. e., all tasks are carried out at higher level, including use of higher levels of inputs such as chemicals and labor (Roumasset, 1976; Uy, 1979). This results in higher yields per hectare.

The attributes of good quality land may also account for higher cropping intensities. The availability of irrigation water offers great potential for increasing cropping intensity. Soil fertility is a determinant of cropping patterns in small farm agriculture where cash inputs are scarce or unavailable. Soil fertility also has an indirect effect on cropping intensity because a fertile soil provides a strong positive inducement for double cropping.

Thus better quality land leads to higher cropping intensity and more intensive cultivation. In turn, higher cropping intensity and more intensive cultivation increases the marginal benefits of mechanization.

Better quality land also leads to use of a higher percentage of hired labor. With higher incomes for the operator as a result of new technology, the marginal utility of not engaging in hard labor is high relative to the marginal utility of additional income. Moreover, the new technology is more management intensive, so the operator allocates a greater proportion of his time to that activity (Roumasset and Smith, 1979; Smith and Gascon, 1979). The shadow price of family labor is higher relative to the shadow price of hired labor which makes the use of hired labor more attractive.

The above explanation indicates that even in the absence of mechanization, we would expect high cropping intensities, higher yields per hectare, increases in total labor and a high percentage of hired labor on farms with good quality land.

Similarly, a high shadow price for family labor and a low shadow price of capital lead to a higher percentage of hired labor and also induce higher levels of mechanization.

Therefore, the correlation between mechanization and the results from the covariance analysis may be partly spurious, i.e., we can explain the relation between mechanization, specialization and intensification without postulating that mechanization causes those trends.

A risk neutral model wherein farmers are assumed to maximize the expected value of accounting profits, accurately predicted the extent of mechanization by farmers. The results of tractor use model relating M

(actual mechanization index of the farm) to M* (optimum mechanization index for maximizing expected profits) showed that M* explained the actual mechanization choice of the farmer and there was no learning lag, i. e. farmers were readily aware of the benefits of using tractors A tractor ownership decision model was found to accurately predict tractor ownership decisions by farmers.

References Cited

Agricultural Development Bank; Research, Project and Planning Division. 1973. Impact of farm mechanization and irrigation and its policy implications. Kathmandu, Nepal.

Pudasaini, Som P. 1976. Resource productivity, income and employment in traditional and mechanized farming in Bara district, Nepal. Unpublished M. S. Thesis, U. P. at Los Baños.

Roumasset, James A. 1973. Risk and choice-of-technique for peasant agriculture: The case of Philippine rice farmers. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Wisconsin.

_____ 1976. Rice and Risk: Decision making among low-income farmers. North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

_____ 1978. Positive methods of agricultural decision analysis (mimeographed).

_____ Joyotee Smith. 1979. Hired labor, family labor and the agricultural ladder. Paper presented at the A/D/C Seminar on the Social Organization of Agricultural Production. Los Baños. January 25-27.

Smith, J. and Fe Gascon. 1979. The effect of the new rice technology on family labor utilization in Laguna. Paper presented at the IRRI Saturday Seminar, IRRI, Los Baños, August 11, 1979. Department Paper No. 79-10.

Uy, M. 1979. Choice of contracts and internal organization in sugar production. Unpublished M. A. Thesis, U. P. Diliman

Table 1. Number of tractors, hand tractors and pumpsets in Nepal, 1965–75.

Year	Type of Machinery		
	4-wheel tractor	Hand tractor	Pumpset
1965–66	111	-	-
1966–67	57	-	10
1967–68	73	-	40
1968–69	195	-	100
1969–70	358	-	1130
1970–74	1061	100	-
1974–75	195	300	2032
Total	2050	400	3500

Source: Agricultural Development Bank, Nepal.

Table 2. Characteristics of 150 sample farms, Parsa and Chitwan, 1977.

Characteristics	Tractor owner	Tractor hiring	Hand tractor owner	Bullock only
Number of farms	41	41	20	48
Age of the farmer	39.27	41.05	42.40	43.48
Year of schooling	5.81	2.73	7.05	1.92
Number of adults engaged in farming	3.68	3.54	3.80	3.46
Farm size (has)	17.69	4.67	4.53	3.01
Number of bullocks/farm	3.71	2.54	1.90	2.60

Table 3. Differences in land preparation labor, post-production labor, total labor and hired labor expenses (rice)

Independent variables	Dependent variables: Land preparation labor (days/ha)		Postproduction labor (days/ha)		Dependent variables: Total labor (days/ha)		Hired labor expenses (Rs/ha)	
	Reg A	Reg B	Reg A	Reg B	Reg A	Reg B	Reg A	Reg B
Intercept	23.54	24.14	32.95	35.87	120.56	122.53	557.58	561.76
Farm size	-0.28 (0.72)	-0.21 (-0.55	-0.64 (-0.79)	-0.30 (-0.45)	-0.57 (-0.36)	-0.12 (-.00)	-0.45 (-0.40)	-0.17 (-0.16)
M1 Hand tractor own	-11.08** (-11.27)	-12.63** (-7.10)	15.01** (7.16)	12.32** (3.60)	10.48** (2.60)	10.24 (1.51)	271.75** (9.41)	297.81** (6.03)
M3 Tractor own	-15.18** (-15.72)	-16.05** (-10.70)	16.38** (7.95)	10.55** (3.65)	14.80** (3.74)	12.52* (2.19)	238.81** (8.42)	225.93** (5.42)
M4 Tractor hire	-6.90** (-8.71)	-7.69** (-5.66)	10.27** (6.08)	3.69 (1.41)	14.43 * (4.44)	5.83 (1.13)	154.83** (6.65)	114.89** (3.04)
I1 Pumpset irrigation	0.41 (0.40)	-3.00 (-1.80)	6.37** (3.01)	-0.73 (-0.23)	12.27** (4.24)	6.28 (0.99)	58.10* (1.99)	-54.20 (-1.17)
I2 Canal irrigation	0.23 (0.30)	0.55 (0.50)	2.15 (1.49)	0.71 (0.33)	6.12* (2.22)	7.20* (1.70)	22.97 (1.16)	42.32 (1.37)
V1 Improved variety	-1.21* (-1.94)	-2.09* (-1.94)	6.11* (4.60)	1.98 (0.96)	4.30* (1.68)	1.06 (0.26)	19.93 (1.09)	22.38 (0.75)
M1I1 Hand tractor own-pumpset irrigation	N. A.	3.46 (1.02)	N. A.	25.76** (3.96)	N. A.	26.10* (2.03)	N. A.	200.16* (2.13)
M1I2 Hand tractor own-canal irrigation	N. A.	-0.97 (-0.45)	N. A.	1.65 (0.39)	N. A.	-4.5[illegible] (-0.54)	N. A.	-16.1[illegible] (-0.27)
M3I1 Tractor own-pump set irrigation	N. A.	3.21 (1.30)	N. A.	1.87 (0.39)	N. A.	-3.80 (-0.40)	N. A.	70.50 (1.30)
M3I2 Tractor own-canal irrigation	N. A.	-1.39 (-0.78)	N. A.	3.74 (1.09)	N. A..	-0.37 (-0.05)	N. A.	-11.33 (-0.23)
M4I1 Tractor hire-pumpset irrigation	N. A.	7.56** (2.90)	N. A.	17.44** (3.48)	N. A.	42.54** (4.29)	N. A.	302.92** (4.19)
M4I2 Tractor hire-canal irrigation	N. A.	-0.14 (-0.08)	N. A.	0.11 (0.03)	N. A.	-3.41 (-0.54)	N.A.	-49.43 (-1.08)
MIV Hand tractor own-improved variety	N. A.	2.30 (1.15)	N. A.	-0.21 (-0.05)	N. A.	0.64 (0.08)	N. A.	-79.20 (-1.42)
M3V Tractor own-improved variety	N. A.	2.28 (1.40)	N. A.	7.51 (2.39)	N. A.	5.83 (0.94)	N. A.	8.97 (0.20)
M4V Tractor hire-improved variety	N. A.	0.32 (0.21)	N. A.	9.32** (3.03)	N. A.	10.61* (1.75)	N. A.	48.80 (1.10)
R^2	0.76	0.77	0.54	0.66	0.29	0.45	0.53	0.61
Adjusted R^2	0.74	0.75	0.52	0.62	0.26	0.38	0.50	0.57
F Statistic	62.65	29.22	23.63	16.10	8.40	6.80	22.70	13.47

N. A. = Not applicable

Regression A is a constrained regression model containing no interaction terms.

Regression B is an unconstrained regression model with interaction terms.

Figures in parentheses indicate 't' statistics.

* Significant at 5% level.

** Significant at 1% level.

Table 4. Differences in level of fertilizer, other cash expenses and cropping intensity (rice)

Independent variables	Dependent Variables: Level of fertilizer (kg N/ha)		Other cash expenses (Rs/ha)		Dependent Variables: Cropping Intensity (Percent)	
	Reg A	Reg B	Reg A	Reg B	Reg A	Reg B
Intercept	22.26	22.22	55.13	50.92	123.72	128.50
Farm size	-0.34* (-1.72)	-0.26 (-1.31)	0.15 (0.25)	0.25 (0.40)	-0.71 (-1.22)	-0.77 (-1.30)
M1 hand tractor own	20.54** (4.08)	24.39** (2.67)	26.44* (1.72)	49.21* (1.72)	48.16** (3.26)	75.46** (2.74)
M3 tractor own	27.92** (5.65)	20.53** (2.66)	54.98** (3.65)	46.63* (1.94)	27.21* (1.87)	17.87 (0.77)
M4 tractor hire	9.92** (2.43)	15.19* (2.17)	22.30* (1.80)	35.18 (1.61)	36.59** (3.07	15.00 (0.71)
I1 Pumpset irrigation	17.52** (3.45)	20.29** (2.37)	18.07 (1.16)	41.89 (1.57)	6.10 (0.41)	22.52 (0.88)
I2 Canal irrigation	5.14 (1.50)	10.46* (1.83)	39.70** (3.79)	54.29** (3.05)	11.80 (1.17)	3.51 (0.20)
V Improved variety	14.63** (4.59)	7.22 (1.30)	10.22 (1.05)	-3.50 (-0.20)	6.29 (0.67)	-2.20 (-0.13)
M1I1 Hand tractor own-pumpset irrigation	N. A.	-18.27 (-1.05)	N. A.	-99.33* (-1.83)	N. A.	-52.70 (-1.01)
M1I2 Hand tractor own-canal irrigation	N. A.	-11.46 (-1.02)	N. A.	-47.91 (-1.37)	N. A.	-32.00 (-0.95)
M3I1 Tractor own-pump set irrigation	N. A.	-8.38 (-0.66)	N. A.	-26.91 (-0.68)	N. A.	-9.58 (-0.25)
M3I2 Tractor own-canal irrigation	N. A.	-9.11 (-0.99)	N. A.	-9.47 (-0.33)	N. A.	22.11 (-0.80)
M4I1 Tractor hire-pump set irrigation	N. A.	0.41 (0.03)	N. A.	-21.41 (-0.51)	N. A.	-22.96 (-0.57)
M4I2 Tractor hire-canal irrigation	N. A.	-9.50 (-1.12)	N. A.	-28.41 (-1.07)	N. A.	23.27 (0.91)
M1V Hand tractor own-improved variety	N. A.	9.32 (0.90)	N. A.	29.25 (0.91)	N. A.	1.23 (0.04)
M3V Tractor own-improved variety	N. A.	23.58** (2.81)	N. A.	28.92 (1.10)	N. A.	2.70 (0.04)
M4V Tractor hire-improved variety	N. A.	1.21 (0.15)	N. A.	10.03 (0.39)	N. A.	24.99 (1.01)
R^2	0.40	0.45	0.25	0.29	0.12	0.16
Adjusted R^2	0.37	0.38	0.22	0.20	0.08	0.06
F statistic	13.40	6.80	6.89	3.33	2.87	1.62

N. A. = Not applicable

Reg A is a constrained regression model containing no interaction terms.

Reg B is an unconstrained regression model with interaction terms.

Figures in parentheses are 't' statistics.

* Significant at 5% level.

** Significant at 1% level.

Table 5. Average statistics of sample farms by mechanization type (rice). (per hectare)

Operation	Tractor owner	Tractor hiring	Hand tractor owner	Bullocks only
Number of farms	41	41	20	48
1. Land preparation labor (m-days)	7.39	15.93	11.85	23.63
2. Post production labor (m-days)	53.90	48.37	52.95	38.86
3. Weeding labor (m-days)	33.42	31.63	33.15	28.02
4. Other pre-harvest labor (m-days)	48.44	46.24	40.60	39.49
5. Total labor (m-days)	143.15	142.17	138.55	127.00
6. Hired labor expenses (Rps/ha)[a]	822.44	739.90	857.85	572.38
7. Level of fertilizer (kg N/ha)	58.26	43.86	54.14	31.03
8. Other cash expenses (Rps/ha)	143.93	106.48	113.52	78.24
9. Yields (kgs/ha)	2409	2030	2345	1568
10. Cropping intensity (%)[b/]	149.56	167.47	179.81	129.56

[a] 1 US$ = Rupees 12

[b] $$\text{Cropping intensity} = \frac{\text{Area under different crops in a given year}}{\text{Total cultivated physical area in that area}} \times 100$$

Table 6. Mechanization and production efficiency 150 rice farms, Parsa and Chitwan districts, 1977.

Independent variables	Dependent Variable Yield in quintals/ha[a/]	
	Regr A	Regr B
Intercept	0.85 (1.03)	1.39* (1.63)
I_1 pumpset irrigation	0.11* (1.81)	-0.001 (-0.02)
I_2 canal irrigation	0.05 (1.35)	-0.03 (-0.46)
V improved variety	0.27** (7.76)	0.16** (2.81)
F_t fertilizer	0.02 (1.02)	0.03 (1.45)
C other cash expenses (Rs)	0.01 (0.20)	0.01 (0.22)
L labor (m-days)	0.38* (2.08)	0.26 (1.38)
M_1 hand tractor own	0.37** (5.35)	0.04 (0.43)
M_2 tractor own	0.37** (5.65)	0.26** (2.96)
M_3 tractor hire	0.14** (3.01)	-0.02 (-0.22)
F farm size	-0.03 (-0.93)	-0.02 (-0.78)
M_1I_1 hand tractor own-pumpset irrigation	NA	0.54** (2.96)
M_1I_2 hand tractor own-canal irrigation	NA	0.26* (2.23)
M_2I_1 tractor own-pumpset irrigation	NA	0.05 (0.36)
M_2I_2 tractor own-canal irrigation	NA	0.12 (1.24)

Table 6 (continued)

M_3I_1 tractor hire-pumpset irrigation	NA	0.23 (1.64)
M_3I_2 tractor hire-canal irrigation	NA	0.06 (0.62)
M_1V hand tractor own-improved variety	NA	0.14 (1.27)
M_2V tractor own-improved variety	NA	0.10 (1.12)
M_3V tractor hire-improved variety	NA	0.22** (2.59)
R^2	0.61	0.65
F statistic	20.61	12.93

NA: Not applicable

Regr A is a constrained regression model containing no interaction terms.

Regr B is an unconstrained regression model with interaction terms.

Figures in parentheses are 't' statistics.

*Significant at 5% level.
**Significant at 1% level.
[a] 1 Quintal = 100 kgs

Table 7. Computation of expected profits and mechanication index under different production techniques on a irrigated rice farm, Maniyari village, Nepal, 1977.

Inputs per hectare	Price per unit	Production techniques[a]											
		A		B		C		D		E		F	
		Units	Value (Rs)	Units	Value (Rs)	Units	Value (Rs)	Units	Value (Rs)	Units	Value (Rs)	Units	Value (Rs)
(1) Tractor (32 hp) use for land preparation (hrs)	For A & B: Rs 36/hr For C & D: Rs 45/hr	7.5	270	8.5	306	6.7	302	7	315	-	-	-	-
(2) Bullock use for land preparation (days)	Rs 15/day	3	45	-	-	6	90	5	75	18	270	18	270
(3) Labor use (days)													
(i) land preparation	For A, B, C, and D: Rs 6/day For E and F: Rs 48/day	4	24	4	24	7	42	7	42	20	96	20	96
(ii) Other labor	Rs 6/day	96	576	100	600	91	546	93	558	79	474	81	486
(4) Chemical fertilizers													
(i) Urea (kgs)	Rs 2.44/kg	54	132	98	239	54	132	65	159	33	80	33	80
(ii) Complesal (kgs)	Rs 2.27/kg	100	227	175	397	75	170	150	341	50	114	125	284
(5) Other chemicals													
(i) metacid (ml)	Rs 15/50 ml	200	60	200	60	200	60	200	60	-	-	-	-
(ii) B.H.C. (kgs)	Rs 2/kg	20	40	20	40	20	40	20	40	20	40	20	40
(6) Seed (kgs)	Rs 2.2/kg	60	132	60	132	60	132	60	132	60	132	60	132
(7) Land rent (Rs)	Rs 38/ha	-	38	-	38	-	38	-	38	-	38	-	38
(8) Irrigation fee (Rs)	Rs 60/ha	-	60	-	60	-	60	-	60	-	60	-	60
Total costs			1604		1896		1612		1820		1304		1486

[a]Production techniques

A - Tractor own, low level of fertilizer

B - Tractor own, high level of fertilizer

C - Tractor hire, low level of fertilizer

D - Tractor hire, high level of fertilizer

E - Bullock operated, low level of fertilizer

F - Bullock operated, high level of fertilizer

Table 7 cont'd.

B. Expected yields, profits and mechanization index on a typical irrigated rice farm, Maniyari village, Nepal, 1977.

Item	Probability level for individual states of nature (out of ten)	Production techniques					
		A	B	C	D	E	F
(1) Yields (kgs/ha)							
(i) Good season	3	1860	2100	1770	1960	1320	1440
(ii) Medium season	4	1500	1680	1440	1590	1140	1200
(iii) Bad season	3	1020	1140	960	1020	900	960
(2) Expected yields[b] (kgs/ha)		1464	1635	1395	1530	1158	1245
(3) Expected revenue[c] (Rs/ha)	Price of rice: Rs 1.64/kg	2401	2681	2288	2509	1899	2042
(4) Expected profits[d] (Rs/ha)		797	785	676	689	595	556
(5) Mechanization index		0.8920	0.9884	0.8000	0.8309	0.0000	0.0000

[b]Expected yields, $E(Y) = Y_j P_j$ where Y_j = Yield in the jth season

P_j = Probability of the jth season

e.g. E(Y) in technique A = 1860 (0.3) + 1500 (0.4) + 1020 (0.3)

= 1464 kgs/ha

[c]Expected revenue, E (R) = Price per unit output x Expected yields

e. g. E (R) for technique A = 1.64 x 1464

= Rs 2401/ha

[d]Expected profits, $E(\pi)$ = Expected revenue - Total costs

e.g. $E(\pi)$ for technique A = Rs 2401 - Rs 1604

= Rs 797/ha

[e]Mechanization index, $M = \frac{A}{A + B + C}$

where A = No. of hours of tractor use for land preparation X tractor horsepower

B = No. of hours (1 day = 8 hours) of bullock use for land preparation X horsepower equivalent of a pair of bullocks (a pair of bullocks = 1 hp)

C = No. of hours (1 day = 8 hours) of human labor used for land preparation X horsepower equivalent of a human laborer (1 human laborer = 0.1 hp)

e. g. M for technique A = $\frac{7.5 \times 32}{(7.5 \times 32) + (3 \times 1 \times 8) + (4 \times 0.1 \times 8)} = 0.8920$

M^* = the level of mechanization which maximizes expected profits on a tractor owning farm.

e.g. M corresponding to technique A, 0.8920 is M_1^* in the above example.

M_2^* = the level of mechanization which maximizes expected profits on a tractor hiring farm.

e. g. M corresponding to technique D, 0.8309 ix M_2^* in the above example.

Table 8. Computation of mechanization index*: A hypothetical example.

Operation (per hectare)	Tractor power				Bullocks (1 pair)				Human labor		
	Proportion of work done by tractor	Hours	Horse power	Horse power hours	Proportion of work done by bullocks	Hours	Horse power	Horse power hours	Hours	Horse power	Horse power hours
First ploughing	1.0	2	32	64	0	0	0	0	2	0.1	0.20
First harrowing	1.0	1.75	32	56	0	0	0	0	1.75	0.1	0.18
Second harrowing	0	0	0	0	1.0	48	1.0	48	48	0.1	4.80
Third harrowing	0	0	0	0	1.0	48	1.0	48	48	0.1	4.80
Puddling	0.5	2	32	32	0.5	24	1.0	12	26	0.1	2.60

$$\text{Mechanization index, } M = \frac{\text{Sum of horsepower hours from mechanical (tractor) power}}{\text{(Sum of horsepower hours from mechanical power + sum of horsepower hours from non-mechanical (bullock and human labor) power}}$$

$$M = \frac{152}{152 + 108 + 12.58} = \frac{152}{272.58} = 0.5576$$

*Assumptions:
(1) A pair of bullock is equivalent to one horsepower
(2) A human laborer has is equivalent to 0.1 horsepower
(3) The horsepower from human labor includes hours worked by tractor operator and bullock operator

Table 9. Assumptions and procedure in the computation of tractor costs

Costs (32 HP Tractor)

(a) Initial cost: Rs 52,000
(b) Interest, depreciation and wages:

(i) Interest: at 25% of initial cost on diminishing balance for 10 years

(ii) Depreciation: at 10% of initial cost each year

(iii) Wages: Driver's salary at Rs 12/day

(c) Working costs:

(i) Diesel consumption at 4 liters/hour at Rs 2.55/liter

(ii) Mobil oil at 7.5 liters/100 hours at Rs 14/liter

(iii) Gear oil at 2.4 liters/100 hours at Rs 20/liter

(d) Repair and Maintenance Costs: at 5% of initial cost per year

Costs (47 HP Tractor)

(a) Initial cost: Rs 80,000
(b) Interest, depreciation and wages:

(i) Interest: at 25% of initial cost on diminishing balance for 10 years

(ii) Depreciation: at 10% of initial cost each year

(iii) Wages: Driver's salary at Rs 12/day

(c) Working Costs:

(i) Diesel consumption at 4.5 liters/hour at 2.55/liter

(ii) Mobil oil at 7.5 liters/100 hours at Rs 14/liter

(iii) Gear oil at 2.4 liters/100 hours at Rs 20/liter

(d) Repair and Maintenance Costs: at 5% of initial cost/year

Assumption

1. The life of tractor is assumed to be 10 years.



Fig.1 Map of Nepal showing Parsa and Chitwan Districts

8-22-79
by: MMT

36



Fig. 1(a). Map of Parsa and Chitwan districts showing village Panchayats surveyed.

Figure 2 Tractor Ownership Decision Model: Schematic Diagram



CONSEQUENCES OF SMALL RICE FARM MECHANIZATION PROJECT

Operations Manual

1. Moran, P. and D. Unson. Farm Survey and Recordkeeping Procedures for Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization Project. Revised May 1980.

2. Wicks, J.A. Procedures for Constructing Two-Way Tables for Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization Project. January 1980.

3. Wicks, J.A. Specification of Variables to be Included in Data Files for Consequences of Small Rice Farm Mechanization Project. October 1980.

Working Papers

1. Juarez, F. and B. Duff. The Economic and Institutional Impact of Mechanical Threshing in Iloilo and Laguna. October 1979.

2. Pathnopas, R. The Economics of Rice Threshing Machines in Thailand: A Case Study of Chachoengsao and Supanburi Provinces. October 1979.

3. Gardezi, J.,A. Rauf, M. Munir, K. Altaf, Q. Mohd-ud-Din, and B. Lockwood. A Study of Mechanical and Traditional Wheat Threshing in Multan District, Punjab, Pakistan: Some Preliminary Results. October 1979.

4. Habito, C. and B. Duff. A Simulation Model to Evaluate Mechanization of Rice Postharvest Operations in the Philippines. October 1979.

5. Chapman, J. The Potential of Mechanization for Crop Intensification in a Rainfed Area - Iloilo, Philippines. October 1979.

6. Thapa, G. The Economics of Tractor Ownership and Use in the Nepal, Terai. October 1979.

7. Jongsuwat, N. Productivity Growth and Farm Machinery Adoption in Thai Agriculture. April 1980.

8. Bernsten, R.H. and R. Sinaga. A Methodology for Identifying Lowland Rice Farms that would Benefit from the Mechanization of Land Preparation. October 1979.

9. Bernsten, R.H. and A. Rochim. Labor Shortage as a Constraint to Increasing Cropping Intensity. Revised March 1980.

10. Ayob, A.M. The Economics and Adoption of the Combine Harvester in the Muda Region of Malaysia. October 1979.

11. Lubis, R. Impact of Cropping Pattern Technology on Income, Employment and Production: A Case Study on Expanded Crop Production in Lampung. October 1979.

12. Wicks, J. A. Modelling the Consequences of Future Mechanization: An Outline of Possible Procedures. October 1979.

13. Khoju, M. R. and J. A. Wicks. Economics of Pump-Irrigation in Eastern Nepal. August 1980.