

Econometric Model of Rice Policy Based On Presidential Instruction

Surya Abadi Sembiring and Julia Hutauruk

Faculty of Agriculture, Catholic University of St. Thomas SU

Email: sabadi@ymail.com, juliahutauruk@ymail.com

Abstract. The objective of research is to build an econometric model based on Presidential Instruction rice policy. The data was monthly time series from March 2005 to September 2009. Rice policy model specification using simultaneous equation, consisting of 14 structural equations and four identity equation, which was estimated using Two Stages Least Squares (2SLS) method. The results show that: (1) an increase of government purchasing price of dried harvest paddy has a positive impact on to increase in total rice production and community rice stock, (2) an increase community rice stock lead to decrease the rice imports, (3) an increase of the realization of the distribution of subsidized ZA fertilizers and the realization of the distribution of subsidized NPK fertilizers has a positive impact on to increase in total rice production and community rice stock and to reduce rice imports, (4) the price of the dried harvest paddy is highly responsive to the water content of dried harvest paddy both the short run and long run, (5) the quantity of rice imported is highly responsive to the imported rice price, both short run and long run.

1. Introduction

According to Timmer [19], most government intervention in their economies to raise resources, at least an indirect effect on food prices facing consumers or crops prices facing farmers. Streeten[17] argued that policymakers are confront with a fundamental dilemma, between high prices for food or lower price food. Tobias et al, [18] described many Asian countries through policy instrument to achieve rice self-sufficiency and stabilize domestic prices. They discussed production policy in Indonesia such as fertilizers subsidy farmers, price supports and food subsidy for rice price.

Based on presidential instruction (*Inpres*), policymaker sets the objectives of rice policy are farmer's income, rural economic development, stabilization of national economy and food security Sembiring. [14]. Sembiring [13] constructed model of rice policy based on Inpres to describe the impact of government policies on farmers income, food price and food security. Dawe [2] discussed that the benefits of stabilizing food prices. Ellis [6] argued that in the cases Indonesian state, Bulog achieves an ostensibly difficult price stabilizations role.

Jha and Srinivasan [7] concluded that price stabilization is the most important element of food policy in India and many other countries in both developing and developed countries. Cumming et al, [1] argued that India, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Philippines are implementing the stabilization of grain prices, Poulton et al, [12] described the impact food price instability on household. The result show that poor consumers, high prices reduce real income, especially during low season

Before the 2010, research on rice policy based on Presidential Instruction (Inpres) was limited in Indonesia. With the development of behavioral equation, Sembiring [13,15] constructed economic analysis on rice policy based on Presidential Instruction. His derived from Timbergen framework policy analysis constructed simultaneous equation. The Timbergen framework is also known as the objectives-



constraints-instruments approach to policy analysis Ellis [5]. Sembiring [15] suggested that policy instrument to achieve food security an increase the government purchased price of dried harvest paddy, an increase distribution of fertilizers, an increase of the number household receive Raskin and to develop irrigation system.

The objective of this study is to constructed econometric model based on Timbergen policy analysis. This study is expected to describe the correlation policy objectives – constrains and policy instrument based on rice policy on presidential instruction.

2. Data and Methods

Data type is monthly time series data Sembiring [13]. The econometric model of rice policy uses a simultaneous equation, consisting of 14 structural equations and four identity equations. The identity equations in this model based on Sembiring [13]. According to Hallam [8], the process of econometric modelling consists of specification, estimation, validation, and finally application Rice policy model specification using simultaneous equation, consisting of 14 structural equations and 4 identity equation. System contains 18 equations (G) with 50 variabels (K). An equation retailer rice price containing 7 variables (M) and the counting rule $(K-M) > (G-1)$, Koutsiannis [11] gives $(50 - 7) > (18-1)$, retailer rice price equation is over identified. Therefore other equation is must over identified. When the equation is over identified it can be proved by 2SLS (Two Stage Least Squares).

3. Result and Discuss

According to Table 2, all the equation has the coefficient of determination R2 than those for quantity of rice import and rate of inflation more than 0.3366. The coefficient of determination R2 close to zero is 0.0704, it means that 7.04 per cent of the variation in quantity of rice import can be attributed to variations in price of import rice, community rice stock and lagged quantity of rice import, Thomas [20]. Definition of variables, as shown in Table 1.

According to Table 2, each lagged variable has a positive sign and significant at the 1 per cent confidence level whereas lagged quantity of rice import significant at the 15 per cent confidence level. According to the estimated equation, all the equation has statistic F than those for quantity of rice import and rate of inflation are significant at the 1 per cent. It means that the explanatory variables of each equation together can explain the endogenous variables well. According to the “(1)” paddy harvested area depends positively and significantly on HPGP, CHIT and LLAPT but for the HJRT variable is negative and significant. Based on the “(2)” yield of paddy depend negatively and significantly HPZA and HPNP, but for T and LYPIT is negative and significant. This is consistent with Sembiring et al, [16], their found that the government policies to increase NPK fertilizers by 15 per cent lead on decrease paddy harvested area 0,288 per cent

Table 1. Definition of the Variables

| Variable | Definition | Variable | Definition | Variable | Definition |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------|--|
| LAPT | Paddy Harveste Area | QPIT | Paddy Production | QBIT | Rice Production |
| HJRT | Price of Producen Corn | QCBB | Bulog Rice Stock | QCBB | Government Rice Stock |
| QMBT | Quantity of Rice Import | QCBD | Community Rice Stock | YPIT | Yield of Paddy |
| HGKP | Price of Dried Harvest Paddy | HBRT | Price of Retailer Price | HMBT | Price of Import Rice |
| INFT | Rate of Inflation | HPBB | Bulog Purchases Rice | T | Trend of Technology |
| CHIT | Average Rainfall | INFB | Rice Contribution to Inflation | STBF | Bulog Rice Final Stock |
| STOB | Bulog Operational Stock | EXRT | Rupiah Exchange Rate | STGF | Government Rice Final Stock |
| RAST | Rice for Poor People | SDBI | Indonesia Rice Surplus | D | Dummy Market Operation |
| HPGP | Government Purchase Price of Dried Harvest Paddy | HPZA | Price of Subsidized ZA Fertilizers | HPNP | Price of Subsidized NPK Fertilizers |
| RGHZ | Rasio HPGP to Ceiling | RGHN | Ratio HPGP to Ceiling Retailer | RTRA | Number of Household Receive Raskin |
| DCBP | Retailer Price of ZA Fertilizers | QBLD | Price of NPK Fertilizers | PBPT | PBPT |
| RPZA | Distribution of Government Rice | RPNP | Rice for Seed, Shrinkage and Others | KAGP | Dried Harvest Paddy with Water Content |
| LLAPT | Realization of the Distribution of Subsidized ZA Fertiizer | LYPIT | Realization of the Distribution of Subsidized NPK Fertilizer | LHBRT | Lagged Price of Retailer Price |
| LQMBT | Lagged Paddy Harvested Area | LINFT | Lagged Yield of Paddy | LQCBG | Lagged Government Rice Stock |
| | Lagged Quantity of Rice Import | | Lagged Rate of Inflation | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|-------|---|
| LRAST | Lagged Rice for Poor People | LHPZA | Lagged Price od Subsidized ZA Fertilizer | LHPNP | Lagged Price of Subsidized NPK Fertilizer |
| LHGKP | Lagged Price of Dried Harvest Paddy | LDCBP | Lagged Distribution of Government Rice | LHMBT | Lagged Price of Import Rice |
| LSTBF | Lagged Bulog Rice Final Stock | LSTGF | Lagged Government Rice Final Stock | | |

All coefficients sign as in “(7)” than STGF agree with prior expectations and all variable than RTRA are statistically significant. The negative sign of STGF indicates that it leads to reduce RAST and significant at the 1 per cent confidence level. The coefficient of RTRA variable is positive and insignificant. All coefficients sign as in “(8)” and in “(9)” agree with prior expectations. In “(8)” all variable than QCBD are statistically significant. In “(9)” all variable than those for HBRT and INFB are statistically significant. The positive sign of QMBT indicates that it leads to increase HMBT and insignificant. This result is similar to Dawe finding [3] found that an increase of Indonesian rice import by one million ton increased price of word rice by US \$ 8,56 per ton, while Dawe [4] found that price of word rice increase by US \$ 12,38 per ton.

As in “(5)” all variable except QCBB are statistically significant and all coefficients agree with prior expectations. Price of dried harvest paddy depend negatively and significantly on the KAGP. The coefficient of HPGP, and LHGKP are positive and significant but for QCBB is insignificant. As in “(6)” show all variable except QCBB are statistically significant and all coefficients than DCBP agree with prior expectations. The coefficients of HMBT, HGKP, STBF, and LHBRT are positive but the coefficient of DCBP is negative, tending to contradict the hypothesis. Price of retailer rice depends negatively and significantly on RAST. The negative coefficient of RAST means the increase in RAST reduce price retailer rice.

All coefficients sign as in “(7)” than STGF agree with prior expectations and all variable than RTRA are statistically significant. The negative sign of STGF indicates that it leads to reduce RAST and significant at the 1 per cent confidence level. The coefficient of RTRA variable is positive and insignificant. All coefficients sign as in “(8)” and in “(9)” agree with prior expectations. In “(8)” all variable than QCBD are statistically significant. In “(9)” all variable than those for HBRT and INFB are statistically significant. The positive sign of QMBT indicates that it leads to increase HMBT and insignificant. This result is similar to Dawe finding [3] found that an increase of Indonesian rice import by one million ton increased price of word rice by US \$ 8,56 per ton, while Dawe [4] found that price of word rice increase by US \$ 12,38 per ton.

Table 2. The estimated econometric model of rice policy based on presidential instruction

EN[#] The structural and identity equation

- (1) $LAPT = -82,7540 + 0,2726 HPGP^{*****} - 0,0583 HJRT + 0,8625 CHIT^{*****} + 0,5614 LLAPT^*$,
(0,488/1,113) (-0,310/-0,297) (0,147/0,334)
 $R^2 = 0.33665$, $DW = 1.7571$, $F = 6.22^*$
- (2) $YPIT = 17,6361 - 0,0007 HPZA^{*****} - 0,0005 HPNP^{**} + 0,0259 T^* + 0,6816 LYPIT^*$,
(-0,281/-0,882) (-0,377/-1,185) (0,155/0,486)
 $R^2 = 0.89721$, $DW = 1.7670$, $F = 106.92^*$
- (3) $HPZA = 314,4367 + 19,7054 RGHZ - 0,8266 RPZA^{*****} + 0,8333 LHPZA^*$,
(0,020/0,121) (-0,026/-0,156)
 $R^2 = 0.71429$, $DW = 1.8594$, $F = 41.67^*$
- (4) $HPNP = 686,0720 + 71,7761 RGHN - 1,9149 RPNP^{****} + 0,8241 LHPNP^*$,
(0,022/0,122) (-0,029/-0,168)
 $R^2 = 0.69947$, $DW = 1.8740$, $F = 38.79^*$
- (5) $HGKP = 2590,6480 + 0,1527 HPGP^{***} - 131,7160 KAGP^* + 0,0076 QCBB + 0,8422 LHGKP^*$
(0,127/0,806) (-1,096/-6,951) (0,005/0,034)
 $R^2 = 0.94945$, $DW = 1.6793$, $F = 230.08^*$
- (6) $HBRT = 83,8785 + 0,0139 HMBT^{****} + 0,5390 HGKP^* + 0,3464 DCBP^{****} - 0,1781 RAST^{***} + 0,0288 STBF^{***}$

- (0,010/0,036) (0,250/0,919) (0,001/0,003) (-0,007/-0,026) (0,008/0,031)
 + 0,7280 LHBRT*, $R^2 = 0.99559$, DW = 1.7138 F = 1769.69*
- (7) RAST = -15,1637 + 0,8692 STOB* + 0,0005 RTRA - 0,7067 QCBG* + 0,6998 STGF* + 0,1365 LRAST*
 (0,955/1,106) (0,039/0,045) (-1,509/-1,747) (1,458/1,689)
 $R^2 = 0.96650$, DW = 2.4375, F = 277.00*
- (8) QMBT = 134,9944 - 0,0203 HMBT**** - 0,0008 QCBD + 0,1536 LQMBT****
 (-1,440/-1,701) (-0,046/-0,055)
 $R^2 = 0.07043$ DW = 2.0606, F = 1.26
- (9) HMBT = -118,9950 + 0,0453HBRT + 0,0120 QMBT + 0,0050 SDBI** + 0,9392 LHMBT*
 (0,064/1,056) (0,0001/0,003) (0,004/0,060)
 $R^2 = 0.94732$, DW = 1.4393, F = 220.28*
- (10) INFT = 1,7776 - 0,0002 HBRT***** + 2,3971 INFB* + 0,00003 EXRT* + 0,0822 LINFT
 (-1,286/-1,401) (0,164/0,178) (-0,397/-0,432)
 $R^2 = 0.15795$, DW = 1.9606, F = 2.30
- (11) DCBP = - 11,5089 - 0,0027HBRT + 17,8076 D* + 0,0526 QCBG*** + 1,8137INFT + 0,4888 LDCB*
 (-1,356/-2,652) (0,684/1,338) (2,189/4,283) (0,133/0,260)
 $R^2 = 0.44954$, DW = 1.8251, F = 7.84*
- (12) STBF = - 31,2846 - 0,4063HBRT + 0,6202 HPBB* + 0,6276 STOB*** + 0,7046 LSTBF
 (-1,380/-4,671) (1,606/5,439) (0,092/0,311)
 $R^2 = 0.71080$, DW = 1.9574 F = 30.11*
- (13) STGF = 43,7619 - 0,4436 DCBP*** + 0,9147 LSTGF* , $R^2 = 0.80437$, DW = 2.0353, F = 104.85*
 (-0,011/-0,128)
- (14) QCBG = -8,6144 + 0,9318 PBPT* + 0,0212 STBF* + 0,9276 LQCBG* $R^2 = 0.95181$, DW = 1.4655 F = 329.20*
 (0,030/0,415) (0,075/1,030)
- (15) QPIT = LAPT x YPIT
 (16) QBIT: Fk x QPIT
 (17) QBLD = Fp x QBIT
 (18) QCBD = QBIT - QBLD

Note: * significant 1%, ** significant 5%, *** significant 10%, **** significant 15%, and *****significant 20%.

In this table the number in parentheses are short run and long run elasticity, and italic number is long run elasticity, Intriligator [9]; the coefficient of determination R^2 , Durbin-Watson statistics are given as DW, and F statistic value. # equations numbering.

Based in “(10)” and “(11)”, the effect of retailer rice price on INFT is found to significant and negative as was not theoretically expected, in addition, the coefficient HBRT on DCBP is negative and is not significant as was not theoretically expected. In “(10)” all variable than those for EXRT and LINFT are statistically significant and in “(11)” all variable than those for HBRT and INFT are statistically significant.

All coefficients sign in “(13)” and “(14)” all variables agree with prior expectations and are statistically significant. Whereas in “(12)” the coefficient of the HBRT and STOB are wrong sign and all variable than those for HBRT and LSTBF are statistically significant. The remaining fourth equations are identities. In “(15)” is total paddy production, in “(16)” total rice production, in “(17)” rice for seed, shrinkage and other, and in “(18)” Community rice stock is the difference between total rice production and rice for seed and others.

The elasticity estimates are shown in Table 2. According to the study on elasticity both short run and long run, there are 6 structural equation have highly responsiveness between endogenous variable and explanatory variables, both short run and long run elasticity: (i) the estimates of the elasticity of HGKP with respect to the KAGP are -1,0969 and -6,951, respectively in equation 5. It means, increasing KAGP by 1 per cent reduce HGKP by more than 1,0969 per cent in short run and 6,951 per cent in long run. (ii) the short run and long run elasticity RAST are -1,509 and -1,747 with respect to QCBG, and 1,458 and 1,689 with respect to STGF in “(7)”, (iii) the estimates of the elasticity of QMBT with respect to the HMBT are -1,440 and -1,701, respectively in equation 8. This indicates that, increasing HMBT by 1 per cent reduce QMBT by more than 1,440 per cent in short run and 1,701 per cent in long run (iv) the short run and long run elasticity INFT are -1,286 and -1,401 with respect to SDBI in “(10)”,

(v) the short run and long run elasticity DCBP are -1,356 and -2,652 with respect to HBRT, and 2,189 and 4,283 with respect to QCBG in “(11)”, and (vi) in “(12)”, the short run and long run elasticity STBF are -1,380 and -4,671 with respect to HBRT, and 1,6068 and 5,4399 with respect to HPBB.

An increase of HPGP has a positive impact on the LAPT, and an increase of the LAPT affects an increase of YPIT. The increase in YPIT was followed by an increase in QBIT, although QBLD increase, QCBD also increased. An increase in QCBD leads to the QMBT to decrease. The increase of HPGP has a positive impact on HGKP. An increase HGKP pushed up the HBRT. In terms of input usage, an increase in RGHZ and RGHN to increase HPZA and HPNP, respectively. Whereas, an increase RPZA and RPNP to reduce HPZA and PHNP, respectively, followed an increase YPIT. An increase YPIT, to increase QPIT and QBIT and QCBD. An increase QCBD to reduce QMBT.

4. Conclusion

An increase of government purchasing price of dried harvest paddy has a positive impact on the increase of total rice production and community rice stock. An increase community rice stock leads to decrease the rice imports. An increase of the realization of the distribution of subsidized ZA fertilizers and the realization of the distribution of subsidized NPK fertilizers have a positive impact on the increase in total rice production and community rice stock and to reduce rice imports. The price of the dried harvest paddy is highly responsive to the water content of dried harvest paddy both in the short run and long run.

5. Another Section of Your Paper

Policy instrument to achieve the objective policy are increasing the government purchased price of dried harvest paddy, distribution of fertilizers, and improve technology.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Higher Education (Dikti) for financial support on this research project.

References

- [1] Cumming J, Rashid RS and Gulati A 2006 Grain price stabilization experiences in Asia: What have we learned? *Food Policy* 31 302
- [2] Dawe D 2001 How far down the path to free trade ? The importance of rice price stabilization in developing Asia. *Food Policy* 26 163
- [3] Dawe D 2002 The Changing structure of the world rice market, 1950-2000. *Food Policy* 27 355.
- [4] Dawe D 2008 Can Indonesia trust the world rice market? *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 34 (1) 115.
- [5] Ellis F 1992 *Agricultural Policies in Developing Countries*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- [6] Ellis F 1993 Private trade and public role in staple food marketing. The case of rice in Indonesia. *Food Policy* 18 428.
- [7] Jha S, Srinivasan PV 1999 Grain price stabilizations in India: Evaluation of policy alternatives. *Agricultural Economics* 21 93.
- [8] Hallam D 1990 *Econometric Modelling of Agricultural Commodity Markets*. (London :Routledge).
- [9] Intriligator, MD 1980. *Econometric Models, Techniques, and Applications*. (New Dehli: Prentice –Hall of India) p 466-499
- [10] Kako T, Gemma M and Ito S. 1997 Implications of the minimum access rice Import on supply and demand balance of rice in Japan. *Agricultural Economics* 16 (3) 193
- [11] Koutsoyiannis, A 1977. *Theory of Econometrics: An Introductory Exposition of Econometric Methods*. (New York :Harper and Row Publishers Inc).p 352-353
- [12] Poulton C, et al. 2006. State intervention for food price stabilization in Africa: Can it work? *Food*

Policy 31 342.

- [13] Sembiring S A 2011 Economic Analysis of Presidential Instruction on National Rice Policy Year 2005-2008. Doctoral Dissertation. Graduate School, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor.
- [14] Sembiring SA 2014 Proc. Nat. Editor Simbolon A. (Medan: Bina Media Perintis). p 20-32
- [15] Sembiring SA 2011 Towards Green Technology for Better Future. Symp., Editor: Halimmatudahlia., Suryanto. D. (Medan: USU Press)
- [16] Sembiring SA, Harianto, Siregar H, dan Saragih B 2012 Dampak kebijakan pemerintah melalui Instruksi Presiden tahun 2005-2008 tentang kebijakan perberasan terhadap ketahanan pangan. Forum Pascasarjana. Vol 35 15.
- [17] Streeten P 1987 Transitional Measures and Political Support for Food Price Policy in Food Policy: Integrating Supply, Distribution and Consumption. Edited by Gittinger. J.P, J.Leslie., C. Hoisington. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press). p 277-281
- [18] Tobias A, Molina I, Valera HG, Mottaleb KA, Mohanty S 2012 Handbook on rice policy for Asia. (Los Banos: International Rice Research Institute). p 22.
- [19] Timmer, C P 1987 Price Policy and the Political Economy of Markets in Food Policy: Integrating Supply, Distribution and Consumption. Edited by Gittinger.J.P, J.Leslie., C. Hoisington. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press). P 264-276
- [20] Thomas, R L 1997 Modern Econometrics An Introduction. (Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman) p 89.