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Summary

This study estimates economic efficiency of yam growing farmers in Oyo State of Nigeria using stochastic frontier production function. The empirical application used farm level data collected from 120 farms following 2007/2008 growing season. The results indicate that farm size, hired labour, yam set and equipment are the major factors that influence changes in yam output. Farm specific variables, such as farming experience, diversification and extension, were the significant factors influencing inefficiency among yam producers. Predicted economic efficiencies range between 0.0094 and 0.876 with a mean economic efficiency of 0.594. Based on these results, sample yam producers could increase their output by 40.6% through better use of available resources.
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Introduction

Yams are members of the genus Dioscorea which contains about 600 species of which only six are important as staples in the tropics. The economically important species grown are *Dioscorea rotundata*, *Dioscorea alata*, *Dioscorea esculenta*, *Dioscorea bulbifera* and *Dioscorea dumetorum* (Ajayi, 2008).

Yam is a preferred food and food security crop in some Sub-Saharan African countries (IITA, 1997). It is widely consumed in West Africa. It is often pounded into a thick paste after boiling (pounded yam) and it is eaten with soup. Yam can also be processed into flour that is used in the preparation of the paste.

Yam tuber contains pharmacologically active substances including dioscorine, saponin and sapogenin. According to Eka (1985), dioscorine, which is a major alkaloid in yam, is medicinally a heart stimulant. The bitter principles of *Dioscorea bulbifera* (called the aerial or potato yam) include a 3 furanoside nordtriterpene called Diosbulbin. These substances are toxic, causing paralysis. Extract are sometimes used in fishing to immobilize the fish and facilitate capture. Zulus use this yam as bait for monkeys and hunters in Malaysia use it to poison tiger (Food-Info, 2008).

According to FAO statistics, the world production of yam was 48.7 million tones in 2005. Out of this 97% came from Sub-Saharan Africa, the main producer being Nigeria with 34 million tones of the world production (IITA, 2007). In the humid tropical countries of West Africa, yams are one of the most highly regarded food products and are closely integrated into the social, cultural, economic and religious aspects of life. Traditional ceremonies still accompany yam, indicating the high status given to the plant (Food-Info, 2008).

Yam is grown for its energy rich tuber. It is adaptable to fairly fertile soils and it is suitable for intercropping with grain legumes such as cowpea, soybean and a variety of leafy vegetables. A well-drained, rich, loamy soil however is the most favorable. It gives more calories per unit of land area than most other crops and matures within seven months. On soils of average fertility, between 20 and 30 tonnes per hectare of tubers can be obtained, and up to 55 tonnes per hectare on fertile soils.

In spite of the tremendous importance attached to the yam, in the West African Sub-region, the crop has hitherto been neglected in policy decisions related to research, production and marketing (Babaleye, 2003). According to Akoroda and Hahn (1995), the production of yam in Nigeria is grossly inadequate and cannot meet the ever increasing demand under present level of input use. In order to meet the level of demand there is a need to assess the level of economic efficiency and its determinants among yam producers.

Materials and methods

Firm efficiency measurement has received considerable attention from both theoretical and applied economists. From a theoretical point of view, there has been a spirited exchange on relative importance of the various components of firm efficiency (Leibenstein, 1996). From the applied perspective, measuring efficiency is important because this is the first step in a process that might lead to substantial resource savings. These resource savings have important implications for both policy formulation and firm management.

The term efficiency is often used synonymously with that productivity, the most common measures that relate output to some input (Lund and Hill, 1979). According to Lovell (1993) the term efficiency refers to the comparison between the real or observed values of input (s) and output (s) with the optimal values of input (s) and output (s) used in a particular production process. Farm efficiency can be measured in terms of technical efficiency, allocative efficiency and economic efficiency. According to Njeru (2004), technical efficiency is the ability of a firm to maximize output for a given set of resource inputs while allocative (factor price) efficiency reflects the ability of a firm to use the inputs in optimal proportions given their respective prices, and production technology. Economic efficiency is the combination of technical and allocative efficiencies (Farrell, 1957).

Taking into account that not all the firms are efficient and the efficient ones have varying levels of efficiency, there arises then the need to measure efficiency. The techniques for measuring efficiency are referred as frontier techniques. Thus, two main approaches can be used to estimate efficiency in a production process: the non-parametric approach and the parametric approach. The non-parametric approach use the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) based on linear programming and consists of estimating a production frontier through a convex curve formed by the line segments joining observed efficient production (Charnes et al., 1978). The main advantage of this technique in the estimation of technical efficiency is that it does not require prices neither for the outputs nor for the inputs. One of the main disadvantages of the non-parametric approach is the absence of accommodation of random shocks or measurement errors in the estimation of efficiency. However, DEA is deterministic and attributes all deviation from the frontier to inefficiency. To measure efficiency using parametric approach, we impose a functional form on the production function between deterministic and stochastic frontiers. Deterministic frontiers assume that all the deviations from the frontiers are result of farm’s inefficiency, while stochastic frontiers decompose deviations into random components reflecting measurement error and statistical noise and a component reflecting farm specific inefficiency (Coelli et al., 1998).

The study was conducted in Oyo State, Nigeria. Primary data were collected with the aid of a well-structured questionnaire. One hundred and twenty (120) yam farmers were randomly selected from areas of intensive yam cultivation that were earlier purposively selected. Baseline information on socio-economic characteristics, input use and output levels as well as their unit prices were collected and analysed. Descriptive statistics were used to explore the socio-economic characteristics and input used of the respondents. Stochastic frontier production function was used to measure economic efficiency.

The stochastic production frontier model used for analysis is of the form

\[ Q_i = f(X_i; \beta) \epsilon^i \]  

where

\[ Q_i = \text{output of the } i\text{th farmer (obtained using gross margin)} \]

\[ X_i = \text{vector of inputs} \]

\[ \beta = \text{vector of parameters to be estimated} \]

\[ \epsilon = \text{stochastic disturbance term consisting of two independent elements } U \text{ and } V \]

\[ U + V \]  

\[ \epsilon = U + V \]
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V is a symmetric random error that is assumed to account for measurement error and other factors not under the control of the farmer e.g. weather and luck (Thanda and Mathias, 1998), while U reflects the technical inefficiency i.e. what is left for the farmer to reach the outer bound production function or the frontier.

The empirical stochastic frontier production model that was applied to the analysis of data is specified as follows:

\[ \ln Q_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 \ln x_3 + \beta_4 \ln x_4 + \beta_5 \ln x_5 + v_i - u_i \]  

where subscript i refers to the ith farmers.

\( Q_i \) is the farm gross margin. Hence the measure of efficiency is economic efficiency (this is done because of the difficulty of getting the output of the farmers in kilograms). This is consistent with earlier work of Coelli and Battese (1996) and Awoniyi and Omonona (2006) that investigate productive efficiency in yam based enterprise using two production systems. Their study found the efficiency index from the two systems to be similar (0.8 and 0.79) with yam set overused. Our study goes further to look at the sources of this efficiency differential that was overlooked by Awoniyi and Omonona (2006) that investigate productive efficiency in yam based enterprise using two production systems.

The mean family labour used was 61.58 man-days with a standard deviation of 16.84 man-days. This is an indication that yam production is labour intensive exercise considering the large variability recorded. The average cost of yam set planted was ₦23,767.50 k with a standard deviation of ₦24,397.38 k indicating a large variability in the yam set usage among the farmers. The average farming experience was 25.0 years with a standard deviation of 11.03 years. This implies that farming experience varied significantly among the farmers. The average years of education was 8.74 years with standard deviation of 3.82 years showing low literacy level of the respondents.

### Results and Discussion

#### Summary Statistics

The summary statistics of variables for the production frontier estimation is presented in Table 1. It was revealed that the average gross margin was ₦88,044.38 k with a standard deviation of ₦50,252.23 k. The large variability by the standard deviation implied that the farmers operated at different levels of farm size that tends to affect their output levels. The mean farm size was 0.47 ha with a standard deviation of 0.22 ha. The variability was due to change in hectares of yam under the production seasons. The mean farm size of 0.47 ha implied that yam producers were small-scale farmers. The mean family labour used was 61.58 man-days with a standard deviation of 16.84 man-days. This is an indication that yam production is labour intensive exercise considering the large variability recorded. The average cost of yam set planted was ₦23,767.50 k with a standard deviation of ₦24,397.38 k indicating a large variability in the yam set usage among the farmers. The average farming experience was 25.0 years with a standard deviation of 11.03 years. This implies that farming experience varied significantly among the farmers. The average years of education was 8.74 years with standard deviation of 3.82 years showing low literacy level of the respondents.

#### Estimates of the parameters of the production function.

The estimated parameters and related statistical test result obtained from the analysis were presented in Table 2. All the coefficients except that of equipment in the model have the expected a priori signs and they were mainly significant. There was a positive relationship between farm size and gross margin.

---

**Table 1. Summary statistics of socio-economic characteristics of yam producers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin (Naira)</td>
<td>88,044.38</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>197,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (Ha)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family labour (Man-days)</td>
<td>61.58</td>
<td>15,482.94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired labour (Naira)</td>
<td>13,871.88</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yam set (₦)</td>
<td>23,767.50</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>157,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming experience (years)</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>2,65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (years)</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit (Naira)</td>
<td>33,887.50</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension (number)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey data.

**Table 2. Maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters of the stochastic production function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>⢪0.65</td>
<td>5.39***</td>
<td>9.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size</td>
<td>⢪0.12</td>
<td>7.61***</td>
<td>4.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family labour</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired labour</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yam set</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>1.85***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>-3.24***</td>
<td>1.764**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency model</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-3.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>⢪0.65</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming experience</td>
<td>⢪0.12</td>
<td>2.66***</td>
<td>2.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>1.90***</td>
<td>1.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>⢪0.65</td>
<td>1.764**</td>
<td>1.764**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance parameter</td>
<td>⢪0.01</td>
<td>4.33***</td>
<td>4.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>⢪0.96</td>
<td>9.37***</td>
<td>9.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood function</td>
<td>⢪0.82</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: computed from Field survey data; *** Significant at the 0.01 level, ** at the 0.1 level.
The magnitude of this coefficient was 0.13. This showed that the gross margin in the yam enterprise is inelastic to changes in the level of cultivated land area. The coefficient was significant at 0.01 levels. Land (farm size) was therefore a significant factor associated with changes in the gross margin in yam production.

The estimated coefficient for hired labour was positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Yam production was labour intensive from cultivation to harvesting. Thus the 0.89 elasticity of labour with respect to gross margin implied that a 1% increase in labour, ceteris paribus will lead to an increase of 0.89% in the farm gross margin and vice versa. The elasticity of labour was a positive decreasing function to the gross margin indicating optimum use and in stage II of the production region.

The elasticity of output with respect to yam set was positive and statistically significant at the 0.18 level. Hence, an increase in the quantity of yam set planted leads to an increase in gross margin. This study was not in line with earlier findings by Awoniyi and Omonona (2006) who reported a negative and insignificant margin. This study was not in line with earlier findings by Awoniyi in the quantity of yam set planted leads to an increase in gross and statistically significant at the 0.18 level. Hence, an increase
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The elasticity of output with respect to yam set was positive and statistically significant at the 0.18 level. Hence, an increase in the quantity of yam set planted leads to an increase in gross margin. This study was not in line with earlier findings by Awoniyi and Omonona (2006) who reported a negative and insignificant margin. Hence, an increase

labour intensive from cultivation to harvesting. Thus the 0.89 elasticity of labour with respect to gross margin implied that a 1% increase in labour, ceteris paribus will lead to an increase of 0.89% in the farm gross margin and vice versa. The elasticity of labour was a positive decreasing function to the gross margin indicating optimum use and in stage II of the production region.

The sources of inefficiency were examined by using the estimated δ-coefficient associated with the inefficiency effects in Table 3. The inefficiency effects were specified as those relating to farming experience, education, credit, diversification and extension contact.

Three of the five variables were statistically significant at different levels. The estimated coefficient of farming experience is positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This indicated that farmers with more years of farming experience were relatively more economically efficient in yam production as the coefficient suggests a positive relationship between experience and the gross margin, and vice versa. This finding agrees with Ike and Inoni (2006).

The coefficient of crop diversification variable was positive and statistically significant at the 0.1 level. As diversification increases as a result of farmers growing more crops, economic efficiency increases. The implication was that greater diversification was associated with higher relative efficiency in yam production.

Contact with extension agents had a positive effect on inefficiency. The result was statistically significant at the 0.1 level. This implies that increase in number of extension visits leads to an increase in economic efficiency of the farmers. This finding differs from earlier findings of Ike and Inoni (2006) that found a negative relationship between revenue and extension contact.

### Variance parameter

The estimated sigma-squared for yam production was 4.38 and statistically different from zero at the 0.01 level. This indicated a good fit and the correctness of the specified distributional assumption of the composite error term. This suggests that the conventional production function was not an adequate representation of the data. Also the magnitude of the variance ratio (γ) estimated at 0.96 was high suggesting that systematic influence that was unexplained by the production function was the dominant source of errors. This means that 96% of the variance in gross margin among the farms was due to differences in economic efficiency.

### Sources of inefficiency

The sources of inefficiency were examined by using the estimated δ-coefficient associated with the inefficiency effects in Table 3. The inefficiency effects were specified as those relating to farming experience, education, credit, diversification and extension contact.

Three of the five variables were statistically significant at different levels. The estimated coefficient of farming experience is positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This indicated that farmers with more years of farming experience were relatively more economically efficient in yam production as the coefficient suggests a positive relationship between experience and the gross margin, and vice versa. This finding agrees with Ike and Inoni (2006).

The coefficient of crop diversification variable was positive and statistically significant at the 0.1 level. As diversification increases as a result of farmers growing more crops, economic efficiency increases. The implication was that greater diversification was associated with higher relative efficiency in yam production.

Contact with extension agents had a positive effect on inefficiency. The result was statistically significant at the 0.1 level. This implies that increase in number of extension visits leads to an increase in economic efficiency of the farmers. This finding differs from earlier findings of Ike and Inoni (2006) that found a negative relationship between experience and the gross margin, and vice versa. This finding agrees with Ike and Inoni (2006).

### Efficiency estimates of the farmers

Given the specification of the Cobb-Douglas frontier production function in equation 3 and 4, the economic efficiencies of yam farmers in Oyo State were calculated. The result indicated that economic efficiency (EE) indices ranged from 0.0094 to 0.876 with a mean of 0.594. The low mean economic efficiency was an indication of inefficiency in resource use by yam farmers in the study area. It also means that for an average efficient farmer to reach the economic efficiency level of his most efficient counterpart, he could experience about (1-0.594/0.876) saving in production or cost savings. This gave about 32.2% increase in cost or increase in production. The least efficient farmer can now save a cost or increase in production of 98.9% (1-0.0094/0.876) to achieve the required economic efficiency of the most efficient farmer in the study area. Also there exists a gap between the efficiency of best economically efficient and that of average farmer. This type of wide variation in farmer specific efficiency levels was a common phenomenon in developing countries (Amaza, 2000).

### Conclusion

Stochastic frontier production function was estimated for yam production in Oyo State of Nigeria with farm size, family labour, hired labour, yam set and equipment as explanatory variables. Farm size, hired labour, yam set and equipment however found to be the significant factors that influence yam output.

In the inefficiency model, the coefficient of farming experience, diversification and extension were found to significantly account for the observed variation in efficiency level among yam producers in Oyo State of Nigeria.

The implication of the study therefore was that the level of efficiency among yam producers in Nigeria could be increased by 40.6% through better utilization of available resources, given the current state of technology.
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