



HAL
open science

A Test of Separability of Consumption and Production Decisions of Farm Households in Ethiopia

Christophe Muller

► **To cite this version:**

Christophe Muller. A Test of Separability of Consumption and Production Decisions of Farm Households in Ethiopia. 2014. halshs-00993393

HAL Id: halshs-00993393

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00993393>

Preprint submitted on 20 May 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A Test of Separability of Consumption and Production Decisions of Farm Households in Ethiopia

Christophe Muller

WP 2014 - Nr 18

**A TEST OF SEPARABILITY OF CONSUMPTION
AND PRODUCTION DECISIONS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS IN ETHIOPIA**

Christophe MULLER

Aix-Marseille University (Aix-Marseille School of Economics), CNRS & EHESS,
Centre de la Vieille Charité, 2, rue de la Charité, 13 002 Marseille, France.¹
Christophe.muller@univ-amu.fr.

May 2014

Codes JEL: O13, Q12, D13

Keywords: Agricultural Household, Separability, Ethiopia

Abstract:

In this paper, we test and reject the separability of production and consumption decisions of agricultural households in Ethiopia, using data from a rural household survey conducted in 1994 and an estimated labour demand equation. We also elicit socio-demographic and asset variables that are positively linked with agricultural labour demands.

These results reflect the limited development of fully organised labour markets in rural Ethiopia. They also imply that purely market-driven agricultural policies, e.g., price subsidies or taxes, may have only limited or perverse impacts, and should be complemented by policies directly affecting household decisions, such as food aid, technology transfer, free supply of fertilizers, etc.

¹ This work has been carried out thanks to the support of the A*MIDEX project (n° ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02) funded by the « Investissements d'Avenir » French Government program, managed by the French National Research Agency (ANR)".

1. Introduction

Because of the proximity of households to subsistence thresholds in very poor countries, survival considerations may be dominating household decisions. In such situations, own-produced consumption strategies may be preferred to commercialization plans jointly with consumption purchases by agricultural households. In such context, the separability of production and consumption decisions of agricultural households, a well-known property under perfect market situations, may be broken.

In this paper, we test the separability of agricultural household decisions in Ethiopia using data from a rural household survey conducted in 1994. In Section 2, we present the agricultural technology model and the data. In Section 3, we discuss the estimation and test results. Finally, Section 4 concludes.

2. The Data and the Model

2.1. The context and the data

At the time of the survey, the agricultural sector in Ethiopia corresponded to about 48 percent of GDP². Rural areas represented near 87 percent of the population, which implies that

² The aggregate indicators for which the source is not specified are extracted from the World Bank, *World Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, 1994 and 1995).

agriculture was the livelihood basis of most households. However, over the period 1970-92, agriculture growth was sluggish at rates between 0.7 and 0.4 percent. Combined with a steady demographic growth, this stagnation of the agricultural output generated a general decline in living standards in rural areas. Indeed, population growth rates reached 2.6 percent over the period 1970-80 period and 3.1 percent over the period 1980-92.

The brunt of the agricultural output was and is still made up of cereal products. The main cereals grown are teff, wheat, barley, maize, sorghum and millet. At the time of the survey, cereals amounted to 83 percent of the cultivated area.³ Farmers contributed to 90 percent of the agricultural output, mostly in cereals that correspond to 75 percent of the cultivated area. This justifies our focus on this type of producers. Yao (1990), who studies aggregate productivity in cereal crops in Ethiopia, and Croppenstedt and Muller (2000), who use this household survey data, show that land and labour are the dominating production factors in explaining agricultural productivity for cereal products in Ethiopia.

However, cereal output dropped by 5 percent between 1980 and 1994 due to adverse weather conditions, violent conflicts and poor policies, whereas population had increased by 40 percent. Such a fragile global food balance is not rare in Ethiopia. Notably, two large scale famines (1973-74 and 1983-85) struck Ethiopia at the end of the last century. Besides, this country may be now again threatened by a new famine episode.⁴ Even in years of normal rainfall, malnutrition is common and food security remains precarious in rural areas (Diriba, 1995, Webb and von Braun, 1994). At the time of the survey, 64 percent of the children below 5 years old were observed suffering from stunting, and 8 percent from wasting

³ Central Statistical Authority, *Agricultural Sample Survey: 'Report on: Area and Production for Major Crops*, Statistical Bulletin, 132, Addis Ababa, 1995.

⁴ See for example <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/08/17/501364/main20093423.shtml>.

(Central Statistical Authority, 1993, Pelletier et al., 1995).

The data we use is taken from the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey conducted in 1995 by the University of Addis Ababa, in collaboration with IFPRI and the University of Oxford⁵. 1477 households were interviewed in 18 peasant associations in 15 Weredas (districts) and 6 regions across the country. Records on crops, production factors and socio-demographic characteristics are available in these data.

The initial sample of surveyed households corresponds to sites that had been chosen by the organisation conducting the survey for their easy access from the road and their ‘interesting’ characteristics. From this benchmark, we only keep the observations that correspond to typical production processes for cereal growers and eliminate missing values. This implies that the studied sample may differ from the average Ethiopian agricultural households by some of their production or socio-demographic characteristics, although this is not blatant in the descriptive statistics. In these conditions, the interpretation of some effects elicited in the regressions may be affected by selection or sampling effects. Since we cannot correct for these deficiencies with these data, we assume that it is not the case.

Specifically, since we want to avoid that the results of our analysis be affected by excessive heterogeneity in agricultural technology, we focus on sites where farmers grow cereals by using ox-plough techniques. Croppenstedt and Muller (2000) discuss these data in details. Moreover, we exclusively include households cultivating at least 0.2 hectares. Indeed, families cultivating almost no land are not likely to be agricultural households, and

⁵ These data have been used in many applied studies of Ethiopian agricultural households, such as for example Dercon and Christensen (2011) and Mani, Hoddinott and Strauss (2012).

consequently the question of separability of consumption and production decisions may not make sense for them.

After dropping observations because of missing values, outliers and erroneous values, we are left with 430 households. Table 1 shows the corresponding descriptive statistics, which roughly fit the commonly known features of this part of Ethiopia. Land is scarce with an average holding area of 1.5 hectare per household. Land quality is described by a multinomial variable (1= best quality, 2= average, 3 = worst quality), which has a mean of 1.67 with this scale. Land steepness (1 = flat, 2 = average, 3 = steepest) is on average 1.29.

The considered households own on average 8.7 farm animals and apply an average of 49 kg of fertilizers per hectare, although 51 percent of households do not use fertilizer. Only 31 percent of households report days worked off the farm. Moreover, over the four months preceding the survey, 91 percent of households reported less than 31 days worked off the farm. It is therefore not irrelevant to approximate the situation of these households by considering that the household family workforce is essentially employed on the farm. These households have an average of six members. Among them, on average about three adults per households are engaged in farming activities and domestic work.

The observed household members have little education. Only 40 percent of these household heads can read and write. Moreover, only an average 23 percent of all other members can read or write. Even for literate members, formal education is rare. A mere 10 percent of the considered heads have achieved completed primary schooling. This is consistent with an average of 0.74 schooling years for heads. We now describe how the labour input is related to

other household characteristics in an elementary model.

2.2. The model

Under perfect markets and no uncertainty, the household decisions can be seen as originated from the maximisation of a utility function representing their preferences under a budget constraint and some technology constraints. In these conditions, and for non-corner solutions, the optimisation program can be decomposed in two stages. In the first stage, the household makes its production decisions by maximising its profit, accounting for market prices of outputs and inputs, including labour, under the technology constraints that it faces. This generates a certain amount of realised profit that can be added to other income sources to yield the full income of the considered household. Then, in a second stage, the household can incorporate this full income in its budget constraint and just maximises its utility under the obtained budget constraint. In that situation, the ‘separability property’ describes the facts that: (1) production decisions affect consumption-leisure decisions only through the profit effect, and (2) the production decisions are not affected by the consumption-leisure decisions or their determinants such as the household preferences.

In contrast, a ‘non-separability’ situation is obtained when, for example, there is no market for labour. In that case, the labour quantity offered by the household, that is, its total available time minus its total leisure, is strictly equal to the labour input on the household exploitation. No family member works off the farm, and no external agricultural worker is employed on the farm. In that case, the labour demand depends on most household characteristics,

including on the determinants of its preferences and on its assets.

We examine labour demand, which is a production decision, in order to test if the considered households are, on average, in a separability situation or not⁶.

Let us consider the following model of agricultural household, directly inspired from Singh, Squire and Strauss (1986), with one good and one input to simplify the discussion.

$$\text{Max}_{c, l, L_{\text{hired}}, L_{\text{ext}}, L_{\text{farm}}} U(c, l)$$

subject to :

$$p c = p F(L_{\text{farm}} + L_{\text{hired}}) - w L_{\text{hired}} + w L_{\text{ext}},$$

$$\text{and } l + L_{\text{farm}} + L_{\text{ext}} = T,$$

where U is the household utility function describing the preferences, while F is the farm production function, c is the consumption demand, l the leisure, L_{farm} is the labour input from household members working on the farm, L_{hired} is the labour input corresponding to hired agricultural workers from the labour market, L_{ext} is the labour supply to the labour market by household members, T is the household total available time, p is the price of the consumption and production good, w is the wage rate, which is assumed to be identical for hired workers and labour supply.

Of course, more complex and realistic hypotheses could be adopted. In particular, we neglect

⁶ Because of the limited sample size we cannot hope to analyze the heterogeneity across households and assumptions of market failure or imperfect markets, as for example in Vakis et al. (2004).

positivity constraints and other possible constraints, and we assume perfect markets. However, this program is useful because it helps us clarifying what the separability property is. Specifically, within this model, the optimisation can be decomposed into two stages. The first one consists in a producer problem based on profit (P) maximisation. It describes household decisions viewed from the producer side.

$$\text{Max}_L P = p F(L) - w L, \text{ where } L \text{ is the total labour input.}$$

Solving this program yields an optimal profit level denoted by P^* . In the second stage, the household maximizes its utility under the resulting budget constraint.

$$\text{Max}_{c, l} U(c, l) \text{ subject to : } p c = P^* + w (T - l).$$

This following graph illustrates the corresponding situation.




Figure 1

In particular, the demand function for the first stage does not depend from the household preferences characteristics. This is not the case for example if there is no labour market, which would correspond to the following optimization program.

$$\text{Max}_{c, l} U(c, l) \quad \text{subject to } c = F(T - l).$$

However, other sources of separability may exist, for example the presence of binding constraints or production uncertainty.

We now specify an agricultural labour demand function in the form of a basic equation that we shall estimate. Specifically, for a household i , we assume:

$\ln(L_i) = b_0 + b_1 \text{LAND}_i + b_2 \ln(\text{LAND}_i) + b_3 \ln(\text{LQ}_i) + b_4 \ln(\text{LS}_i) + X_i'b_5 + \text{site dummies effects} + u_i,$

where the b_j 's ($j=1,\dots,5$) are some coefficient vectors to estimate, L_i is the labour demand of household i , LAND_i is the land area cultivated by the household, LQ_i is the land quality index, LS_i is the land steepness index, X_i regroups socio-demographic household characteristics and u_i is an error term. Since ploughing and harvesting are the two main agricultural tasks, the labour demand variable is measured as being the number of person-days used for these tasks. We excluded the days spent in weeding as this task often does not correspond to intensive work, so much so that it is sometimes hard to distinguish from idleness. Excluding minor tasks has also the advantage of generating a rather homogenous measure of aggregate labour supply.

Vector X_i incorporates characteristics of household preferences that should not be present in a labour demand function under separability since in that case production decisions are independent of household preferences or household assets and depend only on the efficient organization of production and markets. In our applied specification, these preferences characteristics are: ten variables describing the number of members into respective age-gender groups, a dummy variable for heads who can write and read, the number of schooling years of the head, the mean schooling level of household members, a dummy for heads who have completed at least primary education, the average age of the head, the average age of family farm workers (including or not domestic workers), a dummy variable for houses with solid walls (stone, brick, concrete or cement), a dummy variable for houses with a roof made of galvanized iron or wood, a dummy variable for female heads and, finally, the household

size.

We have introduced site dummies in the specification of the labour demand equation in order to capture both the unobserved heterogeneity of local factors associated with the sites and possible measurement errors related to “enumerator effects,” since the data collection in each site was carried out by different enumerators.

Land is the main agricultural input and considered as being fixed. We account for its quality and steepness, as these characteristics may affect the household permanent needs for labour input.

In Ethiopia, labour is the second most important agricultural input, after land. Not only agricultural labour includes diverse tasks, but it is also made up of the contributions of: (1) different family members, and (2) possible temporarily hired workers. As mentioned before, ploughing (LABP) and harvesting (LABH) are the main performed tasks with mean number of days respectively equals to 51 and 68 person-days.

2.3. Separability Tests

Various tests for separability based on agricultural labour demand appear in the literature, starting with Lopez (1984). These tests are often based on the property that under perfect markets and without uncertainty, unearned income and household characteristics such as household composition and assets should not affect the labour demand function for on-farm tasks.

The interpretation of the results of such tests is not obvious a priori as separability and non-separability situations are based only on approximate models. In particular, it may be that the features associated with separability vary, not only with the considered household or period, but also with the complexity of the decision that is referred to. Nonetheless, the fact that household characteristics that have a priori nothing to do with production are affecting production decisions is also interesting in itself, whether related to a precise decision model or not.

Let us first discuss about some of the separability tests in the literature, which are based on similar labour demand equations. Lopez (1984) is the seminal article about separability. In this analysis, Lopez rejected separability using a test of non-nested alternative hypotheses in order to compare a separable model with a non-separable model. However, looking closely at these equations reveals that the non-significance of household demographic characteristics in the labour demand equation plays a crucial role in the test.

Other approaches are possible. For example, Pitt and Rosenzweig (1986) argue that if labour can be hired as a substitute for family labour then farm profits should be unaffected by farmer illness. In the same vein, Behrman, Foster and Rosenzweig (1997) find in Pakistan that planting-stage calorie consumption affects harvest time profit. This suggests that in this context labour markets are not working efficiently at the harvest stage, and that there is no separability. Land demand can also be used for the test. Shapiro (1990) reports that household composition affects the cultivated farm area for a sample of agricultural households from RD Congo.

However, the most common method remains that of testing whether labour demand is affected by determinants of household preferences, for example household composition. This is the case of Benjamin (1992), using Indonesian farm level data, who does not strongly reject the separability of production and consumption decisions on the basis of similar labour demand equations to our setting. Fafchamps and Quisumbing (1997) use rural household data from Pakistan and also reject separability. Other authors also reject the separability property in various contexts (Jacoby, 1993; Kevane, 1994; Udry, 1996; Barrett, 1996).

To our knowledge, the separability hypothesis does not seem to have been specifically tested for Ethiopia, notably through the examination of the labour demand of agricultural households. However, there is an article worth mentioning related to our concerns. Mekonnen (1999) carries out a case study of rural household biomass fuel collection and consumption in Ethiopia, using a non-separable agricultural household model. Of course, since biomass (wood and dung) is simultaneously produced and fully consumed in this context, there is obviously no question of testing separability in that case.

3. The Test Results

Table 2 reports the estimates of the labour demand equation, in which diverse household and house characteristics have been included. As mentioned before, this specification is similar to the one used by Benjamin (1992). House characteristics are included as they are potentially informative on non-earning incomes (e.g., when the house is inherited), assets and household dwelling tastes, various features that do not affect production choices under separability.

The regression is well determined with an adjusted- R^2 of 0.50. Several household composition variables, the dummy variable for house roof made of galvanised iron or wood and the age of the household head have significant coefficients. These results clearly indicate that the separability hypothesis is rejected without doubt. Let us examine these results in detail.

Land has been introduced both in level and in logarithm in the estimated demand equation, so as to better capture some possible nonlinearity. Even if only the coefficient of the logarithm of the land area is significant, it still corresponds to substantial elasticity (0.52) of the labour input with respect to the fixed input that is land. Land slope and land quality have non-significant coefficients. They do not seem to affect the level of labour demand in these data. These three characteristics of land are valid correlates in any equation of labour demand, whether or not the separability hypothesis is satisfied. This is also the case for the site dummies that may recover unobserved agro-climatic features of the environment likely to affect agricultural tasks. This is confirmed by the fact that the coefficients of these site dummies are generally significant, and often even highly significant, except for Site 7.

In contrast, the estimates of the coefficients of the other included regressors should not be significant if the separability hypothesis is satisfied. Among the age categories for the numbers of female members, only the number of female babies (under 5 years old) has a (highly) significant positive coefficient. It may be that babies sometimes imply special urgent needs that must be financed through additional production effort. For male members, the coefficients of the number of children between 10 and 18 years old, and the coefficient of the

number of (non-elderly) adults, are both significant and positive at 5 percent level. This suggests that a higher household male labour force implies higher input, a typical feature of non-separable models where there is no perfect substitutability of family labour by hired labour. Indeed, male teenagers and male adults make up a major part of the household labour force, especially for hard tasks like ploughing. In the absence of an active labour market, the potential labour demand is restricted by the household labour force, which may explain all these demographic effects. Beyond the rejection of the separability, the elicited relationship of labour demand with gender-age classes is more complex than expected.

The education of the head and that of the other household members, as well as their average age and the dummy variable for female heads, have non-significant coefficients. However, the coefficient of the age of household head is positively significant at slightly more than 5 percent level. It may be that the families with more experienced heads have often more ambitious production plans, which requires more agricultural labour.

Households with a house roof made of galvanized iron or wood, that is, with a relatively solid roof in this context, have significantly higher labour demand levels. They may be wealthier households who can afford to take more risk, and therefore a larger production effort. This is not the case for houses with robust walls whose coefficient is non-significant. On the whole, the significance of many coefficients of variables that would be excluded under separability, allows us to reject the separability without doubts.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we test and reject separability between agricultural production decisions and consumption decisions for poor farm households in Ethiopia. This is a confirmation of similar findings for several poor countries in the World. We also elicit socio-demographic and asset variables that are positively linked with agricultural labour demand.

These results may be due to incomplete or missing labour markets consistently with some of the literature. They reflect the limited development of fully organised labour markets in rural Ethiopia.

This situation implies that purely market-driven agricultural policies, e.g., price subsidies or taxes, may have only limited, and perhaps sometimes even perverse, impacts. They should be complemented by policies directly affecting household decisions, such as food aid, technology transfer, training, free supply of fertilizers, etc.

A few limitations nonetheless remain in our analysis. In particular, availing of larger nationally-based samples with more recent data would allow a robust confirmation of the separability in the contemporary Ethiopian context. It would also make possible a more precise investigation of the precise role of socio-demographic human capital characteristics in production decisions.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	RANGE
Production index	1.7	0.22	0.96-2.33
Land (ha)	1.488	1.094	0.21-8.13
Labour for ploughing (person-days)	51.33	56.56	1.00-436.00
Labour for harvest (person-days)	67.92	87.58	1.00-744.00
Land quality	1.670	0.664	1-3
Land steepness	1.286	0.416	1-3
Number of female members aged 0-4	0.470	0.66	0-3
Number of female members aged 5-9	0.488	0.69	0-3
Number of female members aged 10-17	0.637	0.82	0-4
Number of female members aged 18-49	1.144	0.74	0-5
Number of female members aged 50+	0.270	0.48	0-2
Number of male members aged 0-4	0.435	0.63	0-3
Number of male members aged 5-9	0.493	0.72	0-3
Number of male members aged 10-17	0.661	0.83	0-5
Number of male members aged 18-49	1.130	0.72	0-5
Number of male members aged 50+	0.342	0.5	0-2
Female head	0.114	-	0-1
Head's head	44.23	15.14	18-101
Average age	32.79	9.30	17.5-73
Solid walls	0.10	0.31	0-1
Solid roof	0.30	0.46	0-1
Head's schooling (Years)	0.742	2.20	0-16
Average member's schooling (Years)	0.07	0.79	0-6
Head can read and write	0.40	-	0-1
Family size	6.16	2.70	1-17

430 observations.

Table 2: Least-Squares Estimates of Labour Demand

VARIABLE	COEFFICIENT	T-RATIOS
Intercept	4.0970	16.12
Land	0.0199	0.30
ln(Land)	0.5210	4.42
Land quality	-0.0616	1.23
Land steepness	0.0392	0.47
Number of female members aged 0-4	0.1111	2.22
Number of female members aged 5-9	0.0524	1.14
Number of female members aged 10-17	0.0346	0.91
Number of female members aged 18-49	-0.0432	0.97
Number of female members aged 50+	-0.0569	0.82
Number of male members aged 0-4	0.0311	0.64
Number of male members aged 5-9	-0.0438	1.00
Number of male members aged 10-17	0.1057	2.89
Number of male members aged 18-49	0.1509	3.47
Number of male members aged 50+	0.1424	1.53
Head can read and write	0.0582	0.80
Average members' schooling (Years)	-0.0088	0.33
Solid walls	-0.0248	0.17
Solid roof	0.2218	2.90
Female head	-0.0028	0.03
Head's age	0.0064	1.90

Average schooling	-0.0017	0.38
Head's schooling	0.0281	1.33
DU2	-1.0483	3.84
DU3	-0.9041	6.11
DU5	-0.2422	1.57
DU6	-0.6569	4.32
DU7	0.1004	0.72
DU8	-0.4472	3.14
DU9	-0.8095	5.611
DU10	-0.6747	4.53
DU11	-0.9470	5.65
Adjusted-R ²	0.50	

430 observations.

References

Barrett, C., "On Price Risk and the Inverse Farm Size-Productivity Relationship," *Journal of Development Economics*, 51. N. 2, 193-215, 1996.

Behrman, J.R., A.D. Foster and M.R. Rosenzweig, "The Dynamics of Agricultural Production and the Calorie-Income Relationship: Evidence from Pakistan," *Journal of Econometrics*, 77 no. 1, 187-207, 1997.

Benjamin, D., "Household Composition, Labor Markets and Labor Demand: Testing for Separation in Agricultural Household Models," *Econometrica*, 60, no. 2, 287-322, 1992.

Central Statistical Authority, *Report on the National Rural Nutrition Survey, Core Module*, Statistical Bulletin, 113, Addis Ababa, 1993.

Croppenstedt, A. and C. Muller, "The Impact of Health and Nutritional Status of Farmers on their Productivity and Efficiency: Evidence from Ethiopia," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 47, N. 3, April 2000.

Dercon, Stefan & Christiaensen, Luc, 2011. "Consumption risk, technology adoption and poverty traps: Evidence from Ethiopia," *Journal of Development Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 96(2), pages 159-173, November.

Diriba, G., *Economy at the Crossroads: Famine and Food Security in Rural Ethiopia*, Addis

Ababa: Care International, 1995.

Fafchamps, M. and A. Quisumbing, *Human Capital, Productivity, and Labor Allocation in Rural Pakistan*, Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute, 1997.

Jacoby, H., "Shadow Wages and Peasant Family labour Supply: An Econometric Applications to the Peruvian Sierra," *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, N. 3, 903-21, 1993.

Kevane, M., "Agrarian Structure and Agricultural Practice: Typology and Application to Western Sudan," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 78, N. 1, 236-245, 1996.

Lopez, R. "Estimating Labour Supply and Production Decisions of Self-Employed Farm Producers," *European Economic Review*, 24: 61-82.

Mani, Subha & Hoddinott, John & Strauss, John, 2012. "Long-term impact of investments in early schooling — Empirical evidence from rural Ethiopia," *Journal of Development Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 99(2), pages 292-299.

Mekonnen, A., "Rural Household Biomass Fuel Production and Consumption in Ethiopia: A Case Study," *Journal of Forest Economics*, 5, N. 1, 69-97, 1999.

Pelletier, D.L., Deneke, K., Kidane, Y., Haile, B. and Negussie, F., "The food-first bias in nutrition policy: lessons from Ethiopia," *Food Policy*, 20, 279-98, 1995.

Pitt, M.M. and M.R. Rosenzweig, "Agricultural Prices, Food Consumption and the Health

and Productivity of Farmers,” in I. Singh, L. Squire and J. Strauss (eds.), *Agricultural Household Models: Extensions, Applications, and Policy*, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1986.

Shapiro, D., “Farm Size, Household Size and Composition, and Women’s Contribution to Agricultural Production: Evidence from Zaire,” *Journal of Development Studies*, 27 no. 1, 1-21, 1990.

Singh, I., L. Squire and J. Strauss, “Agricultural Household Models: Extensions, Applications, and Policy,” John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1986.

Udry, C., “Gender, Agricultural Productivity and the Theory of the Household,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 104, N. 5, 1010-1046, 1996.

Vakis, R., Sadoulet, E., de Janvry, A. and C. Cafiero, “Testing for separability in household models with heterogeneous behavior: A mixture model approach,” CUDARE Working paper, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, UC Berkeley, 2004.

Webb, P. and Von Braun, J., *Famine and Food Security in Ethiopia: Lessons for Africa*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 1994.

Yao, S., “The Determinants of Cereal Crop Productivity of the Peasant Farm Sector in Ethiopia, 1981-87,” *Journal of International Development*, 8, no. 1, 69-82, 1996.