A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAND SIZE AND, PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY OF TEA SMALLHOLDINGS IN SRI LANKA

BY

N.D.S NARANGODA

Thesis submitted to the University of Sri Jayewardenepura for the award of the Degree of Master of Science in Management on 2008

DECLARATION

The work described in this thesis was carried out by me under the supervision of Dr. Saman Yapa and a report on this has not been submitted in whole or in part to any University or any other institution for another Degree / Diploma.

N.D.S Narangoda

Candidate

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the above statement made by the candidate is true and that this is suitable for submission to the University for the purpose of evaluation.

Dr. Saman Yapa

Thesis Supervisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Table | e of contents | | iii |
|-------|---|--------------------------------|----------|
| List | of Tables | | V |
| List | of figures | | vii |
| Ackr | owledgement | | viii |
| Abst | ract | | ix |
| CHA | APTER ONE Introd | uction | |
| 1.1. | Background of the | study | 1 |
| 1.2 | Justification of res | | 2 |
| 1.3 | Objectives | | 2 3 |
| 1.4 | Rational | | 4 |
| 1.5 | Organization of re- | search | 5 |
| CHA | APTER TWO Litera | ature Review | |
| 2.1 | What is watershed | | 7 |
| 2.2 | Nilwala watershed | | 7 |
| 2.3 | What is tea? | | 8 |
| 2.4 | The Tea sector | | 8 |
| 2.5 | Tea Smallholdings | | 9 |
| 2.6 | Intervention cover | ed by research | 11 |
| 2.7 | Tea Industry | , | 12 |
| 2.8 | Research done by | others | 13 |
| CHA | APTER THREE Re | search Methodology | |
| 3.1 | Data collection pro | ocedure | 15 |
| 3.2 | Data analysis proc | edure | 18 |
| | 3.2.1 Hypothesis | | 18 |
| 3.3 | Yield function | | 19 |
| 3.4 | Production function | n | 20 |
| 3.5 | Marginal physical productivity (MPP) | | |
| 3.6 | Marginal physical productivity (MPP) Specification and Measurement variables 2: | | |
| 3.7 | Comparison of reg | ression lines | 25 |
| | 3.7.1 Tes | t for productivity change | 25 |
| | 3.7.2 Tes | t for difference in intercepts | 26 |
| | | t for Homogeneity of slopes | 27 |

| 2.0 | A selection of variables in Multiple Regression Model | 27 | | |
|--------|---|----------|--|--|
| 3.9 | Analysis of residuals | 28 | | |
| 3.10 | Non consistency of error variance | 28 | | |
| СНАН | TER FOUR Results and Discussion | | | |
| | | | | |
| 4.1 | Type and magnitude of labour used | 30 | | |
| 4.2 | Relationship of land holding size and person days per hectare | 35 | | |
| 4.3 | Use of chemical fertilizer and agro chemicals | 38 | | |
| 4.4 | Cost of inputs and input - output relationship | 44 | | |
| 4.5 | Yield and profits | 49 | | |
| | 4.5.1 Relationship between yield and production cost | 50 | | |
| | 4.5.2 Profitability | 52 | | |
| | 4.5.3 Net Return Per Hectare | 52 | | |
| 4.6 | Selection of models for input-output relationships | 55 | | |
| | 4.6.1 Correlation analysis | 55 | | |
| | 4.6.2 Normal probability plots | 56 | | |
| | 4.6.3 Selection of best model | 57 | | |
| | 4.6.4 Residual plot | | | |
| 4.7 | Results of regression models | | | |
| | 4.7.1 Yield functions | 58 58 | | |
| | 4.7.2 Production function | 60 | | |
| 4.8 | Marginal productivities of input variables | 66 | | |
| 4.9 | Test of productivity change | 69 | | |
| 12 | rest of productivity change | 07 | | |
| Summ | ary of conclusions | 72 | | |
| Refere | nces | 75 | | |
| Annex | ura | | | |
| | | | | |
| Annex | A Normal probability plots of variables | 77 | | |
| Annex | B Summary statistics | 87 | | |
| Annex | C Residual plots for variables | 111 | | |
| Annex | D Formulas for the productivity and profitability | 123 | | |
| Annex | E Questionnaire | 124 | | |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 3.1 | (±11 (10) | Sample sizes in each sub watersheds | 16 |
|------------|--------------|---|----|
| Table 4.1 | | Percentage Distribution of Laoubr input per Hectare for Production Practices in Diyadawa Thanipita and Horagala Sub-watershed by sex and land holding categories | 31 |
| Table 4.2 | ŧ | Distribution of Labour Input (average man days per hectare) by sub-watershed and Holding size | 32 |
| Table 4.3 | i. | Relationship Between Land Holding Size and Labour person days per Hectare | 37 |
| Table 4.4 | : | Distribution of Quantity, and Percentage of Fertilizer Applications by Type of Fertilizer ad size of Holdings | 43 |
| Table 4.5 | : | Distribution of Average Values of Inputs use by size of Holdings | 47 |
| Table 4.6 | : - 1 | Relationship Between Land Holding Size and Total Input Cost | 48 |
| Table 4.7 | : | Variation of Mean Green Leaf Yield by sub-watershed and Holding Size Category | 50 |
| Table 4.8 | | Relationship Between Yield and Total Input Cost | 51 |
| Table 4.9 | : | Variation of Cost, Return and Profits per Hectare by size of Holding and Sub-watersheds | 54 |
| Table 4.10 | | Yield variation by size of Holding | |
| | | (a) Selected Best Yield Functions for Different Land Holding Sizes in Diyadawa Thanipita | 59 |
| | | (b) Selected Best Yield Functions for Different Land Holding sizes in Horagala | 60 |

| Table 4.11 | Corrected Least Square Estimates of the Production Function by size of Holding | |
|------------|--|----|
| | (a) Diyadawa Thanipita - Production Function | 61 |
| | (b) Horagala - Production function | 62 |
| Table 4.12 | Estimated Output Elasticities by size of Land | |
| | (a) Diyadawa Thanipita | 64 |
| | (b) Horagala | 64 |
| Table 4.13 | Variation of Marginal Production of Input by Land Holding Size | |
| | (a) Dyadawa Thanipita | 67 |
| | (b) Horgala | 67 |
| Table 4.14 | Test of Productivity Change by Land Holding Size | 70 |
| Table 4.15 | Test for Difference in Intercepts | 71 |
| Table 4 16 | Test for Homogeneity of Slones | 71 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | 3.1 | : | Distribution of pilot sub-watersheds in Upper Nilwals Watershed | 17 |
|--------|------|---|--|----|
| Figure | 4.2 | i | Percentage Distribution of Labour Input in Diyadawa Thanipita Sub-watershed | 34 |
| Figure | 4.3 | • | Percentage Distribution of Labour Input in Horagala Sub-watershed | 35 |
| Figure | 4.4 | į | Distribution of Person days per Hectare Labour Use in Diyadawa Thanipita and Horagala Sub-watershed | 36 |
| Figure | 4.5 | : | Percentage Distribution of Chemical Fertilizer use in Diyadawa Thanipita Sub watershed | 39 |
| Figure | 4.6 | ; | Percentage Distribution of Chemical Fertilizer Use in Horagala Sub-watershed | 40 |
| Figure | 4.7 | : | Distribution of Quantity of Chemical Fertilizer Application in Diyadawa Thanipita Sub-wartershed | 41 |
| Figure | 4.8 | | Distribution of Quantity of Chemical Fertilizer Application in Horagala Sub-watershed | 42 |
| Figure | 4.9 | 1 | Distribution of Value of Inputs by Land Holding Size in Diyadawa Thanipita Sub-watershed | 45 |
| Figure | 4.10 | : | Distribution of Value of Inputs by Land Holding Size in Horagala Sub - watershed | 46 |
| Figure | 4.11 | : | Variation of Cost and Profits by Land Holding Size in Diyadawa Thanipita and Horagala Sub-watersheds | 53 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to sincerely thank Dr. M. Indralingam, former Head, Department of Mathematics University of Moratuwa for his invaluable guidance and kind supervision of my research and also Dr Saman Yapa Senior Lecturer Department of Decision sciences University of Sri Jayewardenepura for his invaluable guidance and kind supervision of my research and enlightening me on the interpretation and application of economic concepts. And also government officers for providing me the necessary facilities so as to collection of data which were immensely useful to me in the success of this research.

I extend my gratitude to Faculty of Graduate Studies University of Sri Jayewardenepura for conducting the M.Sc Management program and the lecturers of the said program. My thanks are also due to Prof. G.T.F. Silva former Vice Chancellor of the Moratuwa University who not only inspired me to do research in this area but also provided me the immense support so as to enable collection of data.

My special thanks go to my parents for encouraging me to do higher studies and also making financial support for the project work.

Finally, I also thank my dearest sister Lidullka Chaturanie who helped me in numerous ways to make this search a success.

A Study of the relationship Between Land Size and , Productivity and Profitability of Tea smallholdings in Sri Lanka

By

N.D.S Narangoda

ABSTRACT

The goal of the research was to increase the productivity of the natural resources base in Sri Lanka to improve people's livelihoods on a sustainable basis. The study examined variation of land and labour productivity as well as of overall profitability of the tea production due to different land holdings sizes. This study was conducted by selecting a sample of tea smallholders from two sub watersheds namely, Horagala and Diyadawa. The variation of productivity and profitability are determined by making comparisons on parameters of well-fitted yield and production functions. The highest elasticity of labour was for holding size 0.1-0.3 ha, followed by 0.3-0.65ha, and total sample. The elasticities of cost of fertilizer in 0.1 - 0.3 and of total sample are negative. This infers excessive fertilizer application or due to inappropriate time of application by farmers in respective areas, compared to the farmers in 0.3-0.65 ha area. The production elasticities of fertilizer cost were higher and positive in Horagala sub-watershed compared to Diyadawa. This

infers the provision for accommodating more fertilizer to increase the production in Horagala areas. Same inferences apply to the land holding size 0.3-0.65 ha in Diyadawa Thanipita. The elasticity for the cost of conservation seems to be negative for all categories. This infers the fact that the investment for conservation has no immediate impact on production compared to other variables such as fertilizer. In the case of Horagala this was only negative for total sample area. This infers inadequate adoption of conservation practices or poor investment.

The relationship between holding size and production cost indicates consistently inverse relationship. In addition to the holding size the other factors such as labour person days per hectare and cost of fertilizer and agrochemical also indicated inverse relationship. The inverse relationship infers larger farmers are using the land more intensively to obtain higher profitability. The highest mean yield was observed for land holding size category 0.1-0.3 ha in Diyadawa Thanipita and the highes yield variation was indicated in land holding size 0.1 - 0.3 ha of Horagala and the lowest yield variation in holding size 0.1 - 0.3 ha of Diyadaw Thanipita sub-watershed.

The expenditure on conservation practices consistently show negative returns in all categories of Diyadawa and the category of pooled sample in Horagala. This infers marginal returns of the investment due to long term impact on production compared to other inputs. Finally it infers the productivity variation are not identical in two land holding sizes and variation between two holding sizes may not exists within each subwatershed.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Research is based on a participatory watershed management that aimed at developing and testing a historic interdisciplinary approach to integrate environmental and conservation concerns with production goals. The conservation strategy being tested in research is different from traditional approaches. Research hypothesizes that a package of measures such as type of vegetation /crops appropriate land and water saving and conservation practices, user rights to earn economic and other benefits from the participatory conservation of natural resources are more effective in projecting environmentally fragile lands in water basins and watersheds.

Mean while in consideration with Sri Lanka's Tea industry it plays an eminent role in the economy of the country, while accounting for more than a half of the earnings from agricultural exports of the country and occupies nearly one fourth of the total area under

agricultural exports crops. The tea industry in Sri Lanka has experienced intermittent crises for a very long time which become accentuated owing to the higher cost of production compared to other producer countries and due to depressed prices for tea. To overcome these problems and to meet the task of adjusting to the new challenges of raising productivity and remaining competitive. It is necessary to emphasize on the need for well planned development projects and suitable changes in the short and long term policies to formulate them effectively, reliable, adequate, timely data, both past and current on the tea lands would be required.

1.2 Justification of the research

The goal of research is to increase the productivity of the natural resources base in Sri Lanka to improve people's livelihoods on a sustainable basis. The research planned to increase user share of control over natural resources in two sub watersheds through partnerships based on formed agreements between the state and the user's which contribute to greater production while conserving the natural resources base.

The research is designed to strike a balance between production and protection of natural resources in relation to the utilization of land and water in selected sub watersheds. This is to be achieved through the intensification and institutionalization of participatory processes coupled with appropriate technologies.

A unique feature of research is it focuses on watershed as a basic planning, coordinating and implementing unit. The research approach is being tested and demonstrated in one pilot watershed in Sri Lanka namely Nilwala in the Southern Province (wet zone).

1.3 Objectives of the Research

In the context of recent developments in the land labour utilization patterns in the small holdings sector of tea, as discussed above and elsewhere in the literature, the study proposes to examine variation of land and labour productivity as well as of overall profitability of the tea production due to different land holdings sizes.

The Specific Objectives of this study are,

- To identify and quantify the inputs used for different land holding sizes.
- To examine the relationship between type of input use and production
- To determine the land and labour productivity for different land holding sizes.
- To examine the variation of productivity and profitability across different categories of farm sizes.

1.4 Rationale

Most of tea cultivation in the Nilwala watershed area are undertaken by the small holding sector. There are about 23,120 people permanently living in this area and most of them are virtually dependent on the tea industry for their livelihood (B.S Srimal, 1994). The labour input for the industry in the small holding sector is mostly family labour.

One of the biggest problems identified in this area is the uneven distribution of labour among tea small holdings. Owner families resulting in low overall labour productivity in some cases while in certain other cases low land productivity due mainly to shortage of labour. Some families enjoy excess of labour while others suffer from inadequacies of labour, depending on the extent of land under tea for respective family holdings. In some instances where farm families face with labour shortage, packing takes place for almost 12 hours a day resulting in poor quality made tea. Their planting material and fertilizer in turn, the estates have also depended on the smallholder for green leaf for improving capacity utilization in processing, thereby lowering cost of production.

However the development of the estates and smallholders sectors moved in different directions. The large estates tended to absorb modern technologies remained slow to adopt and participate in new technologies. They also mainly used family labour with little overheads. The situation therefore become characterized by two separate type of cultivation, namely 'large estates' and 'smallholdings' Hence the ownership of tea