"Can Customary Land Tenure Facilitate Agricultural Productivity Growth? Evidence from Burkina Faso"
by Yoko Kusunose, Véronique Thériault, and Didier Alia

APPENDIX

Table A1. Crop Inputs Estimation: Summary of First-Stage CRE Probit Results

Endogenous variable:	borrowed plot			maize plot	
Plots:	all	borrowers' plots	maize	all	borrowers' plots
Second-stage specification:	Table 3, (1)	Table 3, (2)	Table 3, (3)	Table 3, (1)	Table 3, (2)
Observations:	19,374	2,969	6,621	19,374	2,969
Instrumental variables:					
children	-0.007	0.030	-0.035	-0.026	-0.068
	[-0.30]	[0.92]	[-1.34]	[-2.51]	[-2.95]
landless household (bin.)	1.803	1.642	1.826	0.143	0.161
	[26.63]	[18.00]	[20.26]	[5.01]	[2.54]
livestock, village-year average	-0.042	-0.102	-0.127	0.022	-0.123
	[-0.63]	[-0.98]	[-1.67]	[0.61]	[-1.81]
recently acquired plot (bin.)	0.073	0.085	0.077	-0.140	-0.075
	[1.14]	[0.71]	[0.95]	[-4.91]	[-1.10]
Control variables:					
head attended prim. school	+			+	
head female	++		+	--	--
head age					
head experienced with credit					
head member of veg. coop.					
total cultivated land	++		++		
non-farm income		--		+	
household size		--		++	++
household livestock					
plot is collectively farmed		--			
years under management	--	--	--	--	--
sloped plot				--	-
lowland plot	++		++		
remote plot	++	++	+	--	--
plot area	--		--	--	--
rainfall				-	
number of agro-dealers	-	++		++	++
population density					
Regression Wald Chi-sq.	1063.86	522.08	603.82	1277.35	343.15
IV joint significance Chi-sq.	726.13	331.18	416.11	59.77	25.26

Source: Authors' calculations based on EPA dataset.
Notes: z-statistics are in brackets below average marginal effects.
++(+) and – (-) signs indicate coefficients with p-values smaller than 0.05 (0.10).
Region dummies, year- fixed effects and time-averages of time-invariant household characteristics included in specification; these results not shown.

Table A2. Plot Investments Estimation: Summary of First-Stage Probit Results

Endogenous variable:	borrowed plot		
Plots:	all	borrowers' plots	all, managed 16+ years
Second-stage specification:	Table 4, (1)	Table 4, (2)	Table 4, (3)
Observations:	6,222	876	3,472
Instrumental variables:			
children	-0.013	0.063	0.064
	[-0.65]	[1.36]	[2.01]
landless household (bin.)	1.961	1.842	2.63
	[29.02]	[12.24]	[18.00]
livestock, village-year average	-0.108	-0.181	-0.222
	[-1.75]	[-1.28]	[-2.05]
recently acquired plot (bin.)	-0.009	0.098	-0.071
	[-0.13]	[0.66]	[-0.57]
Control variables:			
head attended prim. school	++		
head female	++		++
head age		++	++
head experienced with credit			
head member of veg. coop.	++	+	++
total cultivated land	++		++
non-farm income		--	--
household size		-	--
household livestock		+	
plot is collectively farmed		--	
years under management	--	--	--
sloped plot	--		
lowland plot			--
remote plot		+	--
plot area			
rainfall	--		--
number of agro-dealers	++	++	++
population density	+	-	++
Regression Wald Chi-sq.	1534.16	316.61	937.98
IV joint significance Chi-sq.	846.27	152.44	325.71

Source: Authors' calculations based on EPA dataset.
Notes: z-statistics are in brackets below average marginal effects.
++(+) and – (-) signs indicate coefficients with p-values smaller than 0.05 (0.10).
Region dummies included in specification; these results not shown.