# parative Analysis of Resource Use Efficiency nterprises in Lapai Local Government Area of Niger State.

him, F. D<sup>\*1</sup>, A. Y. Musa<sup>2</sup>, K. R. Usman<sup>1</sup>, P. A. Ibrahim<sup>3</sup> and O. B. Adeniji<sup>1</sup>

Department Of Agricultural Economics And Extension, Saat Federal University Of Technology Minna.Niger State. E-Mail idfaith006@yahoo.com

<sup>\*2</sup> C/O Alh. Shulabu Tauheed, Nigerian Immigration Service , H/Qs, Minna, Niger State, <sup>3</sup>National Cereals Research Institute Badeggi, Bida Niger State

### **ABSTRACT**

udy examines the resource use efficiency in cereal crop enterprise production in Lapai Local ment Area Of Niger state. The two cereal crops selected were rice enterprise and sorghum rise. Data for the study was collected from 40 rice farmers and 40 sorghum farmers randomly d In five villages. The data collection was from October to December 2006 cropping season. tion function analysis which incorporates the conventional neoclassical test of economic and al efficiencies were used as the analytical techniques. Profitability analysis was also used to nine the profitable enterprise. Findings revealed that for rice production fertilizer input was Ily utilized by the farmers while other inputs seeds, labour and farm size were over used. On the nand in sorghum production all the inputs seed, labour, fertilizer and farm size were over utilized. rofitability analysis revealed that rice enterprise was the most profitable with a mean net farm e value of N1,419,600.00 per hectare while sorghum had a net farm income of N7,700/ha. The show that there is the need for farmers to be advised on the appropriate allocation of resources ist efficiency and output. This would mean using less of seeds input, labour and farmsize for rice ction, while for sorghum production less of all the inputs should be used.

## ODUCTION

is are the most important source of food ian, early man depended entirely upon s as a major source of food and transition hunting to sedentary life revolves round is. Most ancient civilizations tend to be on ereal crop or another as a source of food. I crops basically include rice, millet, maize, um, wheat, barley etc.

tudy focuses on sorghum and rice cereals, ium grain ranks fifth in the world after t, rice, malze and barley (FAO,2006). num is a major crop for many poor ers especially in Africa, central America and (WIKIPEDIA, 2006).

een 1960 and 1972, sorghum was reported have accounted for 49% of the total uction of cereals in Nigeria and on the age 46% of the acreage devoted to it's ration. (FOS, 1972). Sorghum ominantly a starchy food, it has some in content and a concentration of vitamin mplex on the outer bran layer of the grain /ICRISAT, 1996). Sorghum Is umed in the form of Indigenous food and

drinks, porridges side dishes popped grains.(WIKIPEDIA, 2006).It is a valuable Industrial crop for the brewing of alcohol and non alcoholic drinks as well as in the bakery and confectionary industry .It is also a significant crop for animal feeds, stalks for thatching houses and making fences. ( Oloko et, al. 2000, WIKIPEDIA, 2006).

There was an indication that rice was the major cereals for early societies in China and Sorghum for early societies in Africa (WARDA,1994) . However, rice ranks second in importance among the World population of cereals after wheat followed by maize and sorghum (WARDA, 1994; Jones, 1995).

Rice forms an important component of Nigeria's diet. The average Nigerian consumes 21kg of rice per year representing a percent of total calorie intake and 23% of total cereal (FAO,2004) .Production is consumption primarily by small scale producers with average farm size of 1-2 hectares (WARDA AND NISER,2001). Similar studies carried out by Ibrahim et al. (2005), in the same ecological e die tens grassici struky Asymboli trial torri Alid fire strukturen istry aktoré korriare reseap Etika graditikan, ten rosepka représidant bras Mistoria (n. torri stru dividant to rese Mistoria uni france d'a reseape

Markini iraangan, eni enigi taga nyiggangan Uggand meng UTIII bitati, tyut, tingang Mili tunar nisa ta nitani nait wiltugany ni Janduring dangan marangang birangan gal Markiring mangay U to U, 1994;

timbrains to unrease treet preserves as strong as a unrease treet preserves of a unrease treet preserves of the terms who exists the terms who exists the terms of exists as a unit to the terms of the terms of the treet to the treet to the treet to the treet, and the terms of the treet treet to the treet treet treet, and the term treet tre

course allocation and productivity is an northant aspect of increased toxis (activities by the sales) aspected with the management the farmers who employ these resources in duction. Intrinsic might like resources in indication, the economic optimal level, aligh this backling, this study is arrest at aparting resource afficiency between surgicinal difference contemporals in the study area. The adoption of resource utilization between whom and rice enterprises.

#### THODOLOGY

is study was carried out in Saka district in pail Local Government Area of Higer state, per state lies between latitudes 1/21' and '30' and longitudes 3'30' and longitudes and is dispensably one of the largest fertile ficultural lands in Nigeria covering about 733,170km of the total land area of the untry. The area has a tropical climate marked wet and dry seasons. The inhabitants are anly Nupes, Kakanda, a small fraction of varis and semi sedentary Fulani.

e study focused on two cereal crops in the ea which includes the rice crop enterprise and e sorghum crop enterprise, Sampling ocedure involved a multistage sampling chnique in which firstly Saka district was proving proving by the specification of the contract the specification of the specification o

ENER MEG LIJKESEK I IKK 1818, LILIJKE ISOME ENER STAG ILK ILK ISOMI NIG ILIZAG JANGSAN, IJANESKA, IJALIJK NIG ISOMIKA IJALIJK ISOMIKAKA INTONIA ISOMIKAKA ISOMIKA, INIJAMIKA INIJAKA ISOMIKAKA ISOMIKA ISOMIKA INIJAKA IJANE ILIJKI ISOMIKA ISOMIKA INIJAKA IJANE ILIJKI ISOMIKA ISOMIKA INIJAKA IJANE ILIJKI ISOMIKA

(= \$(f<sub>3</sub>, f<sub>3</sub>, f<sub>4</sub>, f<sub>4</sub>, f<sub>4</sub>, f<sub>5</sub>, f<sub>5</sub>) We keek; (= Cr\$()\$ & bek 866 Spr\$(\$6 1866)\$p\$); k

1 = Seets week is (Ug) 1 = Letrer in misconje 1 = ternima week in (Ug) 1 = term iste in (Hap) 1 = Capital mans, in 14 (Depresies and U tred cop mans,

Four functional forms were tried, and were expressed in the explicit form as;

Ln Y = Inixx + b,in x; +b,in x; +b,in x; +b,in x; +b,in x;+e-dQN 2 (Cxxx)-(xxx)+c)

Y= Into + biln xi+biln xi+biln xi+biln xi+biln Xi+e-----EQN 3 (Semi-kxi)

In  $Y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_3 x_4 + b_3 x_5 + \cdots$   $E(N) \land (Exponential)$ 

Where;

bo = constant.

by by estimated regression coefficients.

e = error term,

 $x_1$ -  $x_5$  = Independent variables

The functional form producing the best fit was chosen as the lead equation based on the following criteria:

The number of estimators that are statistically significant, value of F-statistics, magnitude of coefficient of multiple determination R2

Hory power of the model) and the significance of the magnitudes of the fits and the signs on the estimated the signs on the estimated the signs of the estimated the signs of the estimated the signs of the signs of

y of resource use was determined by wing ratios;

MFC (Rahman and Lawal,2003 and ho et al; 2000)

P, Py

 $\frac{dy}{dx} = b_i$ ,  $Y_i/X_i$ , where the semi-log he lead equation. •  $\frac{dy}{dx} = b_i$ .  $Y_i/X_i$ , where the cobb-

form is the lead equation, dy/dx ≈ b<sub>i</sub>, where linear form is the lation.

Marginal value product of factor x<sub>i</sub>
Marginal physical product
Marginal factor cost, Pxi (unit price of

nmetic mean value of output hmetic mean value of input considered it price of output

iency ratio: where; resource is efficiently utilized resource is under utilized resource is over utilized.

dgeting techniques

argin≕Gross farm income-Total variable

1 Income = Gross margin -Total cost

## 'S AND DISCUSSION

enomic characteristics of respondents ults in table 1 revealed that 48% and f the respondents under rice and 1 enterprise fell within the age range of ears. These distributions indicates that this are highly involved in cereal crop on in the study area. The average lid size was 11 persons for both ses .Rice enterprise constituted mainly 6 male farmers while the sorghum 50 revealed that 17.5% were females 1% males.

ay revealed that farmers operated small rm holdings. The rice enterprise was

characterized by 88,7% farmers having farm sizes of between 3-4 hectares and 11.3% having greater than 4 hectares. The sorghum enterprise revealed smaller farm sizes for farmers showing 38% having between 1-2 hectares and 61.3% having between 3-4 hectares. The level of education is very low with almost 92.5% of farmers in rice enterprise and 90% of farmers in sorghum enterprise having no formal education at all. While 7.5% and 10% from both enterprises revealed that they had Arabic education. The low level of education may have tremendous implication on adoption of Innovation because this is a disadvantage to adoption. Nevertheless, the youthful nature of most of the farmers may be an advantage to innovation, since youths are said to less risk averse and may have better exposure to new ldeas (Obeta *et al)*.

Production input-output relationship

Following the apriori econometric criteria for the selection of the form producing the best fit. The linear functional form was lead equation for rice enterprise while the cobb-Pouglas functional form was lead equation for the sorghum enterprise.

From Table 2, the linear functional form revealed that about 76.4% of the variation in rice output was explained by the factor inputs as indicated by the value of the  $R^2$ . The variables labour  $(x_2)$  and  $\cos t$  of capital items  $(x_5)$  had positive coefficients and were statistically significant at 1% and 10% respectively. The variables seeds  $(x_1)$  and farm size  $(x_4)$  had negative coefficients and were significant at 1% and 10% respectively. Fertilizer  $(x_3)$  had a positive coefficient but was not found to be significant at all.

From table 3, the cobb-Douglas production function revealed that about 78.6% of the variation in sorghum output was explained by the factor inputs as indicated by the R² value. The factor inputs labour  $(x_2)$  and capital items  $(x_5)$  had positive coefficients and were significant at 1%. Seeds  $(x_1)$ , farm size  $(x_4)$  and fertilizer  $(x_3)$  had negative coefficients, with fertilizer  $(x_3)$  and farm size  $(x_4)$  being significant at 1% level of significance.

These positive coefficients implies direct relationship between input and output and that increase in the quantity of these inputs would increase the output. The significant factor inputs implies that, they are the major determinants of output. The negative coefficients implies an inverse relationship between the factor inputs and output, suggesting that an increase in these

factor inputs would decrease output and vice versa.

# Efficiency of resource Use

The marginal contributions of production resources in terms of the physical and value products and the level of input utilization depicting efficiency levels was revealed by tables 4&5 respectively.

The use of an extra unit of fertilizer input in rice production has the highest input of 1.244 and N49.76 addition to rice output and revenue respectively. Followed by fertilizer, while a unit increase in seeds and farm size would result in a reduction in the returns of rice output.

From table 5, in sorghum enterprise the use of an extra unit of labour input has the highest contribution of 2.632 and N 65.8 addition to sorghum production. While in the case of sorghum enterprise, unit increases in seeds, fertilizer and farm size would only result in a reduction in the returns of sorghum output.

In comparing efficiencies of resource utilization in the cereal crop enterprises under study, findings revealed that for rice production fertilizer input was optimally utilized by the farmers, whereas seeds, labour and farm size were overused.

#### Profitability analysis

Table 6 revealed the findings of the gross margins and net farm incomes from the two enterprises respectively. The findings revealed that rice production enterprise contributed greater revenue of a mean value of N 1,419,600.00/ha as compared to the sorghum enterprise of N 7,700.00/ha.

#### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In comparison of efficiency levels of cereal crops under study, rice production enterprise was seen to be more efficient in resource utilization. The study revealed that the inputs in rice production were at least more sub optimally utilized as compared to the sorghum enterprise. Rice production was also seen to be more profitable.

These findings revealed that farmers should be advised to embrace rice cultivation seeing they have a better understanding and application of resource allocation to boost production. However, it also goes to say that to raise output in rice production farmers, should be advised on the use of less of seeds input, tabour input and farm size. While for the sorghum enterprise,

less of all the inputs should be used to approach efficiency level. The study revealed that majority of the farmers were non literate ,thus in advising the farmers on appropriate allocation or resources will require the cooperation of the farmers themselves, the efforts of the research institute, the private sector, the Government and most importantly the extension agents. The extension agents should be on hand to assist farmers make, take and implement the right decisions towards allocation of these resources.

#### REFERENCES

Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2000): Statistical Bulletin Vol. 2 No.2 .

Food And Agriculture Organization, (2006):
Animal feed resources information system (AFRIS). The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

\*Sorghum bicolor\*.

Federal office of statistics (1972): Rural economic survey of Nigeria; Consolidated results of crop estimation survey.

Food And Agriculture Organization and ICRISAT (1996): The world millet and sorghum economies; Facts, trends and outlook.Patancheru and Rome op 68.

Ibrahim, P.D.; Ibrahim, M., Ajayi, O.J. and Ibrahim, P.A.(2005): Effect of the adoption of improved rice varieties on the productivity of small scale farms in Baddegg, Niger state, Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Rural Economy and Society. VOL4, 2007.

Iheanacho, A. C., Olukiosi, J. O. and Oquinbille, A. O. (2000): "Economic Efficiency of resource: Use in Millet Based Oropping Systems in Borno State of Nigeria, Nigerian Journal of Trapical Agriculture, Vol. 2, 2000.

Jones, M. P. (1995) The Rice Plant and its Environment, West African Rice Development Association Training Guide 2, pp. 1-16.

Obeta , M.E. and Nwagbo, E.C. (1997): The adoption of agricultural innovations in Nigeria. A case study of an improved IITA. Technology Package in Anamora state: In Olukosi, A.O. Ogungbile And 8 A. Kalu (eds.); Appropriate technologies for roksource poor farmers. A publication of Nigerian Farming Systems Research Network. pp. 231-245.

Oloko, O.A.; P.O. Oyekan and R.I. Mani (2000). Recent Accomplishments of the National Agricultural. Research Institutes. Agricultural. Science Department, Federal. Development, Abuja. Rural

Rahman, S. A. and Lawal, A. B. (2003): 'Economic Analysis of Maize-Based Cropping Systems in Giva Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria, An International Axurnal or Agricultural Sciences, Science, Environment and Technology, Vol. 3, No. 2,

West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA) and Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) (2001): Report of the Stakeholders Workshop. November 8-9, 2001. Ibadan, Nigeria.

Wikipedia (2006): Sorghum, Wikipedia, The free Encylopedia. Retrieved june 15,2006 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/sorghum

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Variable	SORGHUM			
Age			RICE	
25-40		Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
	39			
41-55	35	48	38	47.5
≥ 56	6	44	28	35
Total	80	8	14	17.5
Educational Status	00	100	80	100
No formal				
Education	74			
Arabic education	74	92.5	72	90
Primary education	6	7.5	8	10
Secondary education				
Tertiary education				
Total	20			
Gender	80	100	80	100
Male	9	7.1		100
Female	80	100	66	82.5
Total			14	
Farm Size (Ha's)	80	100	80	17.5 100
≤ 1.				100
1-2				
3-4			31	20
≥ 4	71	88.7	49	38
	9	11.3	15	61.3
Total	80	100	80	100
Household Size			80	100
≤ 10				
11-15	56	70		
≥ 16	24	30	64	80
Total	80		16	20
ource; Field survey data 2006.	UU	100	80	100

Variable Constant	Regression Coefficient	- Control		and the second second second second
	-745.421	T-Values	R <sup>2</sup>	E ratio
Seeds (Kg) (X <sub>1</sub> ) Labour (X <sub>2</sub> )	-4.153	-3.879°	0.764	F-ratio
	0.681	-3.538* * *	0.704	36.659
Fertilizer (kg) (X <sub>3</sub> )	1.244	6.469***		
Farm size (Ha's) (X <sub>4</sub> )	-0.240	-0.789		
Capital Items (N) (X <sub>5</sub> )		-1.772*		
spectively.	2.223 06. Note: ***, ** and * implies	1.707*		

Source: Field survey data 2006. Note: \*\*\*, \*\* and \* implies statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% levels,

Table 3: Estimated Cobb-douglas function for sorghum enterprise

Variable Variable	Iglas function for sorghum en	terprise		
Constant	Regression Coefficient	T-Values		
Seeds $(Kg)(X_1)$	4.231	3.027'''	R <sup>2</sup>	F-ratio
Labour (X <sub>2</sub> )	-7.626E02	-0.587	0.786	34.793
Fertilizer (Kg) (X <sub>3</sub> )	0.476	5.171***		
Farm size (Ha's) (X <sub>2</sub> )	0.194	-2.211*		
Capital items (N) (X-)	-7.915E -02	-1 002*		
Source: Field survey data 2006, respectively.	0.441	1.355		
respectively.	and * implies sta	atistical size is		

Source: Field survey data 2006, Note: \*\*\*, \*\* and \* implies statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% levels,

Table 4: Efficiency of resource use in rice enterprise.

Resource	resource use in rice ent	terprise,		
Seeds	MPP (bi)	MVP (bi.py)	MEC (N)	
Labour	-4.153	-166.12	MFC ( <del>N</del> )	MVP/MFC
Fertilizer	0.681	27.24	300	-5.53
Farm size	1.244	49.76	50	0.0908
	-0.240	-9.6	-	0.9952
Source: Field survey of	lata 2006,		1500	0.0064

Table 5: Efficiency of resource use in sorghum enterprise

Resource	MPP (bi)	MVP (bi.py)		
Seeds	374.89	-9372.25	MFC (H)	MVP/MFC
Labour	2.632		18	-520.680
Fertilizer	-4.516	65.8	300	0.219
Farm size	437.77	-112.9 -10,944.25	50	-2.258
ource: Field survey data	2006.	10,944.25	1500	-7.296

Table 6: Profitability Analysis Of Rice And Sorghum Crop Enterprise

Mean values/ha	Rice And Sorghum Crop Enterprise		
Gross farm income	RICE( N)	SORGHUM (N)	
Total cost	1,968,000.00	177,000.00	
Fixed cost	548,400.00		
	38,372.75	169,300.00	
Variable cost	510,027.25	23,112.05	
Gross margin	1,457,972.75	146,187.95	
Net farm income	1,419,600.00	30,812.05	
ource: Field survey data 2006.	1,115,000.00	7,700.00	

f