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Abstract

This study examined the relationship between farm size and technical efficiency in small holder cassava production in Ideato LGA of Imo state using data from a 2008 farm-level survey of 90 rural households. The study showed a strong inverse relationship between farm size and technical efficiency. Smaller farms are found to be more technically efficient, than larger farms. These results favour land redistribution policies targeted towards giving lands to the small-holder farmers. Policies of de-emphasizing cassava production in the estate sector while encouraging it in smallholdings will foster equity and efficiency.
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Introduction

Cassava is a staple food crop in South-Eastern Nigeria. It contributes about 15\% of the daily dietary energy intake of most Nigerians and supplies about 70\% of the total calories intake of about 60 million people in Nigeria (Ezulike \textit{et al.}, 2006). Nigeria is the world’s largest producer of cassava, with about 45.75 million metric tones and ranks 2\textsuperscript{nd} after yam in extent of production among the root and tuber crops of economic value in Nigeria (FAO, 2007). Planting of high yielding and improved varieties has resulted in higher cash income, especially in areas with access to improved processing technology and market (RMRDC, 2004)

One of the important economic arguments in favor of the equitable distribution of farmland is that smaller farms are more productive (Masterson, 2007). The majority of studies of agricultural productivity in developing countries support the view that there is an inverse relationship between productivity and farm size (Berry and Cline, 1979; Barrett, 1996; Heltberg, 1998; Hazarika and Alwang, 2003; Masterson, 2007; Gul Unal, 2008; Okoye \textit{et al.}, 2007, 2008a and 2008b). Land reform could contribute to improving both equity and efficiency in agriculture. One of the most common characteristics of developing countries is the large share of agriculture in their economies. This feature produces the widely observed inverse size-yield relationship (IR) (Gul Unal, 2008).

Due to its policy implications for employment, efficiency, equity, and sustainability, IR has been one of the most important and hotly debated topics in agricultural economics for more than 40 years. (Heltberg, 1998 and Gul Unal, 2008). One critique leveled at the literature on the productivity-farm size relationship is that the measure used, land
productivity, is inappropriate. Because it only compares total output to the size of the farm, ignoring other factors of production and inputs, land productivity is said to be, at best, an incomplete measure of efficiency (Masterson, 2007). This study will address this issue. Small farms have both higher land productivity and equal or better technical efficiency. This is true even when controlling for many of the factors literature suggests as possible explanations for the inverse relationship (ibid, 2007).

Following the classical definition of Farrell (1957), a firm is considered to be technically efficient if it obtains the maximum attainable output given the amount of inputs and the technology used. Since technical efficiency is unobservable, it has to be estimated somehow. In the parametric approach the typical way to do this is to model inefficiency as part of the random term (Aigner et al., 1977). By examining the relationship between farm size and technical efficiency in cassava production, this paper aims to discover whether smallholder cultivation has increased efficiency. This paper explores the relationship between farm size and technical efficiency in small-holder cassava production in Ideato LGA of Imo State.

Methodology
Analytical Procedures
a. Stochastic Frontier Model
In our analysis of the data we use the Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier production function. Since the basic stochastic frontier model was first proposed by Aigner et al. (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977), various other models have been suggested and applied in the analysis of cross-sectional and panel data on producers. Some models have been proposed in which the technical inefficiency effects in the stochastic frontier models are also modeled in terms of other observable explanatory variables (Seyoum et al., 1996). The stochastic frontier model is defined thus;

\[ \ln Y_i = f(\ln X_i; \beta) \exp (V_i - U_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \]  

where the subscript, i, indicates the ith farmer in the sample (i =1, 2, ..., 90); ln represents the natural logarithm (i.e., logarithm to base e); Y represents the productivity of cassava (kg/ha); Xi is the vector of input quantities used by the i-th farm, \( \beta \) is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated, \( f(\ ) \) represents an appropriate function (e.g Cobb-Douglas, translog etc). The Vi’s are assumed to be independent and identically distributed random errors having \( N(0, \sigma^2_v) \) distribution; and the Ui’s are non-negative random variables, called technical inefficiency effects, which are assumed to be independently distributed such that Ui is defined by the truncation (at zero) of the \( N(0, \sigma^2_u) \) distribution (i.e. half-normal distribution) or have exponential distribution. The maximum-likelihood estimates for all the parameters of the stochastic frontier and inefficiency model, defined by Eq. (1), are simultaneously obtained by using the program, FRONTIER Version 4.1 (Coelli, 1996). The technical efficiency of production of the ith farmer in the appropriate data set, given the levels of his inputs, is defined by Technical efficiency (TE) = \( Yi/Yi^* \)

\[ = f (X_i; \beta) \exp (V_i - U_i) / f (X_i, \beta) \exp (V_i) = \exp (-U_i) \]  

Where Yi is the observed productivity and Yi* is the frontier productivity. The technical efficiency of a farmer is between 0 and 1 and is inversely related to the level of the technical inefficiency effect. The technical efficiencies can be predicted using the
b. Empirical Model
The stochastic frontier model for farmers is defined by the the Cobb-Douglas type defined as follows:

\[ \ln Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \beta_3 \ln X_3 + \beta_4 \ln X_4 + \beta_5 \ln X_5 + \ln V_i - \ln U_i \] .......(3)

Where \( Y \) is productivity of cassava in kg/ha., \( X_1 \) is farm size in hectares, \( X_2 \) is labour input in mandays, \( X_3 \) is fertilizer input in kg, \( X_4 \) is planting material in bundles and \( X_5 \) is capital input in naira made up of depreciation charges on farm tools and equipment, interest on borrowed capital and rent on land. \( \beta_0-\beta_5 \) are regression parameters to be estimated while \( V_i \) and \( U_i \) are as defined earlier.

Determinants of Technical Efficiency
In order to determine factors contributing to the observed technical efficiency in cocoyam production, the following model was formulated and estimated jointly with the stochastic frontier model in a single stage maximum likelihood estimation procedure using the computer software Frontier Version 4.1 (Coelli, 1996).

\[ \text{TE}_i = a_0 + a_1 Z_1 + a_2 Z_2 + a_3 Z_3 + a_4 Z_4 + a_5 Z_5 + a_6 Z_6 \] .......(4)

Where \( \text{TE}_i \) is the technical efficiency of the \( i \)-th farmer; \( Z_1 \) is farmers age in years; \( Z_2 \) is farmers level of education in years; \( Z_3 \) is no of extension contacts; \( Z_4 \) is household size; \( Z_5 \) is farm size in hectares and \( Z_6 \) is square of farm size in hectares while \( a_1-a_6 \) are parameter estimates.

Data
The study was carried out in Ideato North L.G.A. of Imo State using a two-stage randomized sampling technique. At the first stage, three circles were randomly selected from the LGA. At the second stage, 30 farmers were randomly selected form each circle using the community list of farmers from the ADP for detailed study. This gave a total of 90 farming households. Data were collected by means of well structured questionnaires on their production activities in terms of inputs, output, and socio-economic characteristics for the year 2008.

Results and Discussion
Average Statistics of Cocoyam Farmers: The average statistics of the sampled cassava farmers are presented in Table 1. On the average, a typical cassava farmer in the LGA is 48 years old, with 10 years of education. The average cassava farmer cultivated 1.47 ha, made an average of 1 extension contact in the year, used about 257.08kg of fertilizer and 68 bundles of cassava stems, spent about ₦1542.12 on capital inputs, employed 145 mandays of labour and produced an output of 4635kg of cassava. The results of the analysis show that individual farm level technical efficiency was 75%.

Table 1: Average Statistics of Cassava Farmers in Ideato LGA of Imo State, Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 1: Estimated Cobb-Douglas Stochastic Frontier Production Function for Cassava Farmers in Ideato LGA of Imo State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant term</td>
<td>$\beta_0$</td>
<td>5.1554</td>
<td>0.8496</td>
<td>6.0674***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size</td>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>-0.2016</td>
<td>-0.0322</td>
<td>-6.2433***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>0.5811</td>
<td>0.1642</td>
<td>3.5382***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>$\beta_3$</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
<td>5.4670***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting Materials</td>
<td>$\beta_4$</td>
<td>0.2694</td>
<td>0.2412</td>
<td>1.1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$\beta_5$</td>
<td>-0.3050</td>
<td>0.5620</td>
<td>-0.5437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elasticity</td>
<td>$\beta_6$</td>
<td>0.5314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, 2008

Table 2 presents weighted maximum-likelihood estimates of the stochastic production frontier. The productivity of cassava significantly increases at 1% level in the value of output per hectare, with increase in labour and fertilizer. Productivity, however, appears to decrease with farm size and was significant at 1%. The coefficients for depreciation in capital inputs and planting materials had a negative and positive relationship with productivity but were not significant. The elasticity of production of farmers was estimated to be less than one (0.53). Decreasing returns to scale would explain the inverse relationship (Masterson, 2007). This is perhaps not surprising, given that the mean farm size for cassava in the area is 1.4ha.

The estimated variance ($\sigma^2$) is statistically significant at 1% indicating goodness of fit and the correctness of the specified distribution assumptions of the composite error term. Gamma ($\gamma$) is estimated at 0.962 and is statistically significant at 1% indicating that 96.2% of the total variation in cassava output is due to technical inefficiency.
Sources of Technical Efficiency

The estimated determinants of technical efficiency in cassava production as presented in Table 2 shows that age, farm size and farm size interaction had a negative and significant effect on efficiency at 1% level of probability. We expect age to have a positive relationship since age is used as a proxy for experience. However, old age might pose disadvantages in agriculture because most of the work is physically demanding and also because older household heads might be too conservative to try new, more efficient techniques. This is in line with the findings of Ajibefun and Daramola (2003); Ajibefun and Aderionla (2004); Okoye, 2007; 2008a and 2008b).

One reason why small farms produce more value per hectare is because land utilization is much higher on smaller farms since large farms cultivate less land in proportion to their size, i.e., larger farms have more idle land. Thus, even if small and large farms produce equal value of output per hectare cultivated, this does not disprove the “IR puzzle.” (Gul Unal, 2008). Doubling the farm size also results in decreased technical efficiency. Research in developing countries has centered round the ‘inverse hypothesis’ that smaller farms are more productive because land is used more intensively (Bharadwaj, 1974 and Cornia, 1985).

Conclusion
Given the inverse productivity/efficiency-size relationship in agriculture, what is needed for increased productivity and efficiency in agriculture and overall growth is land redistribution supported by technical and financial assistance for farmers. Policy conclusion to be drawn from these results is that policies favorable to large-scale farms...
may foment overall growth in the agricultural sector, but they will do less than nothing to combat the problem of rural poverty. They will contribute neither to the well being of small farmers nor to employment opportunities for landless peasants, since the larger farms are so capital intensive. It is no stretch to say that the argument for redistribution of land is bolstered by this study. Giving land to smaller farms will increase overall productivity and efficiency, as well as improve the welfare of the small and landless peasantry. The questions of how to achieve this goal is outside the scope of this study. The results also call for policies aimed at encouraging new entrants especially the youths to cultivate cassava.
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