## Land rental market and rural household efficiency in China

Jean Paul Chavas<sup>1</sup>, Guanming Shi<sup>1</sup> and Xiangyi Meng<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA and <sup>2</sup>China Institute of Public Finance and Policy, Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China

Corresponding author. Email: jchavas@wisc.edu

# **ONLINE APPENDIX**

#### Appendix A. Measuring production efficiency

Estimating the efficiency indexes TE in (4) and AE in (6) requires knowing the underlying technology. Consider a sample of n observations of farm-households, where  $(x^j, F^j, H^j, L^j)$ is the vector of inputs and  $(y^j, N^j)$  is the vector of outputs chosen by the j-th farm household, j = 1, ..., n. Under feasibility, we have  $(x^j, F^j, H^j, L^j, y^j, N^j) \in X$ , where X is the feasible set of household production activities.

These production data can be used to provide a representation of the technology X. Two methods have been proposed in the literature. The first method involves the parametric specification and estimation of a stochastic production frontier (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2003). The second method is nonparametric and involves the smallest set containing the observed inputs and outputs (e.g., Afriat, 1972; Varian, 1984; Färe *et al.*, 1985). The nonparametric method has also been called Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) as it involves finding the tightest envelope of observed inputs and outputs. In this paper, we follow the nonparametric approach, where X is represented by the set

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{X}^{e} &= \{ (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{L}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{N}) \colon \boldsymbol{y} \leq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{y}^{i}, \boldsymbol{N} \leq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{N}^{i}, \boldsymbol{x} \geq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{x}^{i}, \boldsymbol{F} \geq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{F}^{i}, \\ \boldsymbol{H} \geq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{H}^{i}, \boldsymbol{L} \geq \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} \ \boldsymbol{L}^{i}, \\ \Sigma_{i} \ \lambda_{i} &= 1, \\ \lambda_{i} \geq 0, i = 1, \\ \dots, n \}. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $X^e$  is closed and convex (Afriat, 1972; Varian, 1984). Using  $X^e$  as representation of technology, the technical efficiency index *TE* in (4) for the *j*-th farmhousehold is obtained by solving the linear programming problem

$$TE(\mathbf{x}^{j}, \mathbf{F}^{j}, H^{j}, \mathbf{L}^{j}, \mathbf{y}^{j}, N^{j}, \mathbf{X}^{e}) = 1/\max_{\gamma, \lambda} \{ \gamma, \gamma \mathbf{y}^{j} \le \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} \mathbf{y}^{i}, \gamma N^{j} \le \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} N^{i}, \mathbf{x}^{j} \ge \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} \mathbf{x}^{i}, \mathbf{F}^{j} \ge \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} \mathbf{F}^{i}, H^{j} \ge \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} H^{i}, \mathbf{L}^{j} \ge \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} \mathbf{L}^{i}, \Sigma_{i} \lambda_{i} = 1, \lambda_{i} \ge 0,$$
  
$$i = 1, \dots, n \}.$$

$$(4')$$

Similarly, from (5), the maximum revenue for the *j*-th household under the nonparametric representation  $X^e$  is obtained from the linear programming problem  $R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}^j, H^j, \mathbf{L}^j, \mathbf{X}^e) = \max_{\mathbf{y}, N, \lambda} \{\mathbf{p}'\mathbf{y} + N : \mathbf{y} \le \Sigma_i \lambda_i \mathbf{y}^i, N \le \Sigma_i \lambda_i N^i,$  $\mathbf{x}^j \ge \Sigma_i \lambda_i \mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{F}^j \ge \Sigma_i \lambda_i \mathbf{F}^i, H^j \ge \Sigma_i \lambda_i H^i, \mathbf{L}^j \ge \Sigma_i \lambda_i \mathbf{L}^i, \Sigma_i \lambda_i = 1, \lambda_i \ge 0,$  $i = 1, ..., n\}.$  (5')

For each farm household, using  $TE(\cdot)$  in (4') and  $R(\cdot)$  in (5') generates estimates of the allocative efficiency index  $AE(\cdot)$  in (6).

### References

Afriat SN (1972) Efficiency estimation of production functions. International Economic

*Review* **13**, 568–598.

Färe R, Grosskopf S and Lovell CAK (1985) The Measurement of Efficiency of

Production. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, Pub.

Kumbhakar SC and Lovell CAK (2003) Stochastic Frontier Analysis. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Varian H (1984) The nonparametric approach to production analysis. Econometrica 54,

579–97.

## **Appendix B. Tables**

|                | Remittance | Land lease-in | Land rent-out |
|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Intercept      | 3.334***   | 0.806***      | -0.053*       |
| county1        | -1.454*    | -0.335**      | -0.002        |
| county2        | -0.629     | -0.221        | 0.113***      |
| county3        | 1.236*     | -0.009        | 0.016         |
| county4        | 0.495      | 0.106         | 0.055***      |
| county5        | 0.431      | -0.142        | -0.001        |
| county6        | -1.404**   | 0.470***      | 0.043*        |
| county7        | -1.060     | 0.328**       | 0.042*        |
| county8        | -1.836     | -0.046        | 0.018         |
| Age of hh head | -0.025*    | -0.011***     | 0.001***      |
| Dist_c         | -0.109     | 0.348         | 0.004         |
| Dist_b         | 0.268      | 0.305         | -0.029        |
| F-value        | 2.398      | 5.209         | 3.798         |
| P-value        | 0.002      | 0.001         | 0.001         |

**Table A1.** First-step estimation in the control function approach

*Note*: The stars indicate the level of significance: \*\*\* p < 0.01, \*\* p < 0.05, \* p < 0.1.

| Efficiency     | Technical efficiency (TE) |                      | Allocative efficiency (AE) |                   |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
|                | Nonlinear least<br>square | Median<br>regression | Nonlinear<br>least square  | Median regression |
| Intercept      | 2.724***                  | 1.071                | 0.475**                    | 0.178             |
| Head_edu1      | 0.005                     | -0.038               | -0.019                     | -0.065*           |
| Head_edu2      | 0.230                     | -0.031               | -0.107                     | -0.115**          |
| Female head    | 0.503                     | 0.177                | 0.438***                   | 0.329***          |
| Age of hh head | -0.007                    | 0.002                | -0.001                     | 0.0003            |
| Hh size        | -0.041                    | -0.011               | 0.072***                   | 0.056***          |
| Dist_c         | 0.257                     | 0.217                | -0.064                     | 0.035             |
| Dist_b         | -0.604                    | -0.760**             | -0.237                     | -0.340**          |
| Remittance     | -0.163*                   | -0.130*              | -0.039                     | -0.002            |
| Land Lease-in  | 0.040                     | 0.504                | 0.873***                   | 0.621***          |
| Land Rent-out  | -0.378                    | 0.215                | 1.214                      | 0.501             |
| ê-remit        | 0.199**                   | 0.138*               | 0.072**                    | 0.025             |
| ê-lease        | 0.154                     | -0.498               | -0.922***                  | -0.648***         |
| ê-rentout      | 1.308                     | -0.145               | -0.031                     | 0.028             |

Table A2. Factors affecting efficiency – robustness check

*Notes:* The nonlinear-least-squares model is based on the specification  $mean(E) = 1 - \exp(-Z\gamma)$ , where mean(E) is the expected value of the efficiency index E,  $Z = (Z_1, Z_2, ...)$  are the explanatory variables and  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_1, ...)'$  is the vector of corresponding parameters. The stars indicate the level of significance: \*\*\* p < 0.01, \*\* p < 0.05, \* p < 0.1.