



International Journal of Agriculture Development

ISSN (Online): 3107-5347

IJAD 2025; 1(3): 14-16

2025 May - June

www.allagriculturejournal.com

Received: 16-04-2025

Accepted: 13-05-2025

Published: 01-06-2025

The Effect of Government Subsidies on Farmer Productivity in Developing Countries

SBN Joferfe

Independent, USA

Corresponding Author; **SBN Joferfe**

Abstract

Government subsidies—particularly for fertilizer, seed, and credit—remain among the most widely used agricultural policy instruments in developing countries. This article reviews the empirical evidence on how such subsidies affect farmer productivity, examining both the theoretical rationale for intervention and the mixed results observed across Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and other developing regions. While input subsidies can raise yields and correct market failures under specific conditions, their long-run productivity impact is frequently constrained by poor targeting, fiscal unsustainability, crowding-out of commercial input markets, and persistent technical inefficiency among smallholders.

Keyword: Rationale, Poor Targeting, Fiscal Unsustainability

Introduction

Agricultural productivity growth is widely regarded as a precondition for poverty reduction and food security in low- and middle-income countries, where a large share of the population depends on smallholder farming for its livelihood. Since the 2007–2008 global food price crisis, many developing-country governments have revived large-scale subsidy programs—chiefly for fertilizer, improved seed, and agricultural credit—to boost staple crop output ^[1]. This article synthesizes recent empirical literature to assess whether, and under what conditions, these subsidies translate into sustained productivity gains for farmers.

The Rationale for Agricultural Subsidies

The conventional economic case for subsidizing agricultural inputs rests on the existence of market failures that are especially pronounced in developing countries: missing or incomplete credit markets, high transaction costs for delivering inputs to remote areas, information gaps about fertilizer response rates, and price risk that discourages investment by risk-averse smallholders. Where these constraints bind, subsidies can, in principle, raise input use toward the socially optimal level and generate productivity gains that would not otherwise occur ^[1]. This logic has driven a resurgence of input subsidy programs across Sub-Saharan Africa since the early 2000s, often with donor support, after several decades in which such programs had been scaled back under structural adjustment ^[1].

3. Evidence of Positive Productivity Effects

Several country-level studies find that subsidized input use does raise yields, at least in the short run. In Malawi, farmers who received subsidized fertilizer achieved significantly higher maize yields in the years they received the subsidy compared with farmers who did not, although the yield response depended heavily on whether the farmer would have purchased fertilizer commercially in the subsidy's absence ^[2]. In Kenya, a program of small, time-limited discounts for fertilizer delivered at the point of harvest—rather than blanket subsidies—was found to meaningfully increase fertilizer uptake and profitability among smallholders by addressing procrastination and liquidity constraints rather than price alone ^[3]. In Ghana, cross-sectional evidence from maize plots showed a statistically significant yield response to nitrogen application and confirmed that fertilizer use remained profitable for farmers at both subsidized and market prices, suggesting that price was only part of the constraint on adoption ^[4].

Constraints That Limit Productivity Gains

Despite this evidence of short-run yield effects, several structural weaknesses temper the productivity case for subsidies.

Crowding-out and diversion. A multi-country study across Sub-Saharan Africa found that a substantial share of subsidized fertilizer displaces fertilizer farmers would have

purchased commercially rather than adding to total use, and that a portion of subsidized inputs is diverted before reaching intended beneficiaries—both of which dilute the net productivity impact of the programs relative to their fiscal cost [5].

Impermanence of gains. Longitudinal evidence from Tanzania illustrates that productivity gains linked to subsidized inputs can be fragile: a program combining plot-specific fertilizer recommendations with a subsidy raised fertilizer use and maize yields during the intervention, but a five-year follow-up found that these effects largely dissipated once the subsidy was withdrawn, indicating that subsidies alone may not durably shift farmer behavior absent complementary information or market development [6].

Technical inefficiency. Access to subsidized inputs does not automatically translate into higher productivity if farmers are technically inefficient in how they combine inputs. Research on smallholder maize producers in Malawi found substantial gaps between actual and potential output given existing input use, implying that a meaningful share of farmers could raise yields considerably without any additional inputs simply by using them more efficiently [7]. Complementary extension and advisory services appear to matter here: propensity score matching evidence from Malawi found that access to agricultural extension services significantly increased farmers' technical efficiency, over and above the effect of input subsidies themselves [8].

Fiscal Sustainability and Cross-Country Evidence

Beyond the microeconomic evidence, cross-country analysis offers a more aggregate perspective. Using a long panel covering 42 countries and over 80 percent of global agricultural production, one study found that input subsidies were associated with a strong positive effect on both output growth and labor productivity, while output subsidies had a smaller effect confined to output growth, and decoupled (non-production-linked) subsidies showed no significant productivity effect at all [9]. This suggests the design of a subsidy—not merely its existence—determines whether it functions as a productivity-enhancing instrument or primarily as an income transfer. At the same time, sustained input subsidy programs impose considerable and recurring fiscal costs; policy analysis has cautioned that long-term reliance on subsidies is difficult to sustain fiscally and can crowd out other productivity-enhancing public investment, such as research, extension, and rural infrastructure, unless programs are well-targeted and periodically reformed [10].

Policy Implications

Taken together, the evidence points toward several conditions under which subsidies are more likely to raise farmer productivity:

- **Targeting** subsidies toward farmers who genuinely lack access to commercial input markets, rather than universal coverage, reduces crowding-out and improves cost-effectiveness [2, 5].
- **Pairing subsidies with information and extension services** helps farmers convert input access into actual efficiency gains, addressing the technical inefficiency that limits returns to inputs alone [7, 8].
- **Time-limited, well-designed incentives** that address behavioral and liquidity constraints (rather than open-ended price supports) can achieve similar adoption effects at lower fiscal cost [3].

- **Exit strategies and complementary investment** are needed since subsidy-driven gains can dissipate once support is withdrawn; building farmers' independent capacity to access inputs and credit is important for durability [6, 10].
- **Subsidy design matters more than subsidy size:** input-linked subsidies tend to outperform decoupled transfers in raising productivity, but fiscal sustainability requires careful program scale and periodic evaluation [9, 10].

7. Conclusion

Government subsidies can play a legitimate role in raising farmer productivity in developing countries where market failures genuinely constrain input use, and there is credible country-level evidence of positive short-run yield effects in Malawi, Kenya, and Ghana. However, the productivity case for subsidies is far from unconditional: poor targeting, market crowding-out, weak persistence after program withdrawal, and unaddressed technical inefficiency all reduce their effectiveness, while large-scale programs carry substantial fiscal costs. Policymakers seeking productivity gains—rather than simply income transfers to farmers—should prioritize targeted, time-bound, and information-complemented subsidy designs, and treat subsidies as one component of a broader agricultural productivity strategy rather than a stand-alone solution.

References

1. Druilhe Z, Barreiro-Hurlé J. Fertilizer subsidies in sub-Saharan Africa. ESA Working Paper No. 12-04. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2012.
2. Ricker-Gilbert J, Jayne TS, Black JR. Does subsidizing fertilizer increase yields? Evidence from Malawi [Internet]. Selected paper presented at: Agricultural & Applied Economics Association 2009 AAEA & ACCI Joint Annual Meeting; 2009 Jul 26–29; Milwaukee, WI. Available from: <https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/49532/files/42422.pdf>
3. Duflo E, Kremer M, Robinson J. Nudging farmers to use fertilizer: theory and experimental evidence from Kenya. *Am Econ Rev*. 2011;101(6):2350–90.
4. Ragasa C, Chapoto A. Moving in the right direction? The role of price subsidies in fertilizer use and maize productivity in Ghana. *Food Secur*. 2017;9(2):329–53.
5. Jayne TS, Mather D, Mason N, Ricker-Gilbert J. How do fertilizer subsidy programs affect total fertilizer use in sub-Saharan Africa? Crowding out, diversion, and benefit/cost assessments. *Agric Econ*. 2013;44(6):687–703.
6. Tamim A, Harou AP, Burke M, Lobell D, Madajewicz M, Magomba C, *et al*. Relaxing credit and information constraints: five-year experimental evidence from Tanzanian agriculture. *Econ Dev Cult Change*. 2025;73(3):1409–37.
7. Chirwa EW. Sources of technical efficiency among smallholder maize farmers in southern Malawi. AERC Research Paper 172. Nairobi: African Economic Research Consortium; 2007.
8. Jolex A. Influence of agricultural extension services on technical efficiency of maize farmers in Malawi. *Afr J Agric Resour Econ*. 2022;17(1). doi:10.53936/afjare.2022.17(1).6

9. Mamun A. Impact of farm subsidies on global agricultural productivity. *Agric Econ.* 2024;55(2):346–64.
10. International Monetary Fund. Agricultural producer subsidies: navigating challenges and policy considerations. *IMF Notes.* 2024;No. 2024/002.

How to Cite This Article

Joferfe SBN. The Effect of Government Subsidies on Farmer Productivity in Developing Countries. *International Journal of Agriculture Development.* 2025; 1(3): 14-16.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.