

Analysis of Economic Efficiency of Maize Production in Ganye local Government Area Adamawa state, Nigeria

¹Zalkuwi, J. W. ²Y. Z. Dia and ³R. Z. Dia

¹ Departments of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Adamawa State University P.M.B. 25 Mubi, Nigeria.

² Department of Agricultural Extension, Adamawa State College of Agriculture P.M.B. 2088, Ganye, Nigeria.

³ Program Mentor, European Unions Increasing Non State Actors Implementation and Development Expertise (EU INSIDE) project Northeast Nigeria Bauchi Base Office, Nigeria.

yahayadia@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study presents the analysis economic efficiency of maize production in Ganye local government in Adamawa state, Nigeria. A multi stage sampling techniques was used to select 200 farmers in the study area. Result of the net farm income (NFI) and return on naira invested (ROI) per hectare were N57, 052.97, N31, 098.79, N30, 239.78 and N1.13 respectively. The results shows that maize farming in the study area is profitable and Economics of Scale was obtained as 1.252 ($E_s > 1$), hence economics of scale exists. Results of the stochastic frontier cost function showed that variance parameter γ () and σ^2 () are both significant at 1% level. Parameter of estimate indicated positive relationship and significance at 1% level for fertilizer, herbicides, seeds and hired labour. Mean cost efficiency index was 1.04, slightly above frontier cost indicating that they are efficient in allocating their scarce resources. Some constraint to maize farmers in the study area is inadequate credit, inadequate contact with extension agents and lack of improved seeds. The study recommended that the work of extension agents should be intensified in the study area. [Report and Opinion 2010;2(7):1-9]. (ISSN: 1553-9873).

Key words: Economics efficiency, stochastic frontier, cost function, net farm income, maize production, Ganye L.G.

Introduction

Maize and other cereals constitute important sources of carbohydrates, proteins, vitamin B and minerals (Iken *et al*, 2002). Maize is a stable food crop for most sub-Saharan Africans of which Nigeria is inclusive with per capital kg/year of 40 (FAOSTAT 2003). In Nigeria maize is the third most important cereal crop after sorghum and millet (Ojo, 2000), the demand for maize as a result of various domestic uses shows that a domestic demand of 3.5 million metric tonnes outstrips supply production of 2 million metric tonnes (Akande, 1994). The ability of the Nigerian agriculture to perform its role in agricultural development according to Ogunsumi *et al* (2005) has been on decline in the last three decades. Hence the Nigerian government adopted different agricultural programmes and policies aimed at raising productivity and efficiency of agricultural sector. These programs and policies placed the small holder farmers in central focus. This was due to the fact that the nation's agriculture has always been dominated by the smallholder farmers who represent a substantial proportion of the total farming

population and produce over 90% of the total agricultural output in the country (Ajibefun *et al*, 2002).

Low capitalisation, price fluctuation, disease and pest, poor storage facilities and inefficiency of resources utilization are the identified problem in maize production in Nigeria (Ojo, 2000). In view of this production efficiency of smallholder farms has important implication for the development strategies adopted in many developing countries where the primary sector is still dominant. An improvement in the understanding of the level of production efficiency and its relationship with host of farm level methods can greatly aid policy makers in creating efficiency, enhancing policies as well as judging the efficacy of the present and past government reforms in the agricultural sector.

The broad objective of this study is to examine the economic efficiency in small scale maize production in Ganye local government in Adamawa State Nigeria.

The specific objectives are to:

- Determine the cost efficiency of the farmers in the study area.
- Determine the profitability and economics of scale of maize farming in the study area.
- Identify the major constraints militating against maize production in the study area.

Hypothesis of the study

Null Hypothesis (H_0)

H_0 : there is no significant relationship between maize output and the input used by the farmers.

Theoretical Framework

Efficiency is the act of achieving good result with little waste of effort. It is the act of harnessing materials and human resources and coordinating these resources to achieve better management goal. Ferrell (1957) distinguished between technical and allocative efficiency (or price efficiency) as a measure of production efficiency through the use of frontier production and cost function respectively. He define technical efficiency as the ability of affirm to produce a given level output with a given with a minimum quantity of input under certain technology and allocative efficiency is the ability of the firm to choose optimal input level for a given factor prices. In Ferrell framework, economic efficiency (EE) is an overall performance measure and is equal to the product of Technical Efficiency (TE) and Allocative Efficiency (AE) (i.e. $EE=TE \times AE$). Therefore technical and allocative efficiency are components of economic efficiency (Abdulai and Huffman, 2000).

Economic application of the stochastic frontier model for efficiency analysis include Aigner *et al* (1977) in which the model was applied to U.S. agricultural data. Battese and Corra (1977) applied the technique to the pastoral zone of eastern Australia. More recently, Ogundari and Ojo (2005), Ojo (2004), Ajibefun *et al* (2002), Brevo-Ureta and Pinheiro (1993) and Ali and Byerlee (1991) in which they offer a comprehensive review of the application of stochastic frontier model in measuring of the agricultural producers in the developing countries.

Production is define as the transformation of goods and services into finished products (that is input – output relationship) and this is applied to every production process, maize production inclusive (Oyewo *et al* 2009). The production technology can be represented in the form of cost function.

function represent the dual approach in the technology is seen as a constant towards the optimizing behaviour of firms (Chambers, 1983). In the context of the cost function any error of optimization is taken to translate into higher cost for the producers. However the stochastic nature of the production frontier would still imply that the theoretical minimum cost frontier would be stochastic.

Material and Methods

Study Area -This study was based on the farm level data and small scale maize farmers in Ganye local government in Adamawa state, Nigeria, the study area comprises of different villages which are rural in nature. Ganye is located approximately on the intersection of latitude 9°8'N and longitude 11°5'East. It has a land mass of 22, 775.30Km² and a population of 681,353 (Adebayo and Tukur, 1999, NPC, 2007). Ganye is located with the savannah belt of the Nigeria's vegetation zones (Adebayo and Tukur, 1999).

Sampling Procedures- Maize farmers are the target respondents for the study. 200 maize farmers were selected from the study area and were used for the study. The sampling technique employed is the multistage stratified random sampling technique. The first stage involved purposive selection of the rural areas such as Yebbi, bakari Guso, Jaggu, Timdore, Sugu, sangasumi and Gurum respectively. The second stage involved simple random sampling through random selection of 200 maize farmers in the study area.

Source of data- Questionnaire and interview schedule were the source used to collect data from the farmers for the study.

Data Analysis- The data obtained from the field were subjected to analysis using inferential statistics and correlation analysis, which was used to test the hypothesis. The stochastic frontier production model was used to determine the between the dependent variable (maize output) and the independent variables as well as to determine the technical efficiency in farmers operation in the study area.

Model Specification

Net farm income (NFI) analysis

The net farm income analysis was used to determine the profitability of maize production in the study area. The net farm income analysis is given by

$$\text{NFI} = \text{GM} - \text{TFC}$$

$$\text{GM} = \text{TR} - \text{TVC}$$

Where

GM = Gross margin (N)

TR = Total revenue (N)

TVC = Total variable cost (N)

$$\text{TR} = P_y \cdot Y$$

Where

P_y = Price per unit output (N)

Y = Total quantity of output (Kg)

$$\text{TVC} = \sum P_{xi} X_i$$

Where

P_{xi} = Price per unit of output (N)

X_i = Quantity of i th input used per unit

Net Return (NR)

$$\text{NR} = \text{GM} - \text{TFC}$$

Where TFC = Total cost of production per hectare (N)

(Average annual depreciation cost for all input will be used)

Stochastic frontier model specification

In this study Battese and Coelli (1995) model, as used by Ogunhari *et al* (2006), was used to specify a stochastic frontier cost function with behaviour inefficiency component and to estimate all parameters together in one step maximum likelihood estimation. This model implicitly expressed as

$$\ln C_i = g(P_i, Y_i, \beta) + (V_i - U_i)$$

Where

C_i = the total production cost

g = suitable functional form such as Cobb Douglas

P_i = vector variable input prices (transport, fertilizer, labour, seed and herbicides)

Y_i = the value of maize produce in kg

V_i = the systematic component which represents random disturbance cost due to factors outside the scope of the farmers.

U_i = the one sided disturbance farm used to represent cost efficiency and is independent of V_i .

= the parameter of the estimate

Moreover for the study the cost efficiency of an individual farm is define in terms of the ratio of the observed cost (C^b) to the corresponding minimum cost (C^{\min}) given the available technology. That is cost efficiency (C_{EE}).

$$\frac{C^b}{C^{\min}} = \frac{g(P_i, Y_i, \beta) + (V_i + U_i)}{g(P_i, Y_i, \beta) + (V_i)} = \exp(U_i)$$

Where

C^b = the observed cost represents the actual total production cost

C^{\min} = minimum cost and represents the frontier total production cost or least cost total production level.

$$C_{EE} = \exp(U_i)$$

C_{EE} takes the values of 1 or higher with 1 defining cost efficient farm. And following the adoption of Battese and Coelli (1995) framework for the analysis of data, the explicit Cobb Douglas functional form for maize farm in the study area is therefore specified as follows;

$$\ln C_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln R_{1i} + \beta_2 \ln R_{2i} + \beta_3 \ln Y_i + \beta_4 \ln R_{4i} + \beta_5 \ln R_{5i} + \beta_6 \ln R_{6i} + \beta_7 \ln Y_i + (V_i + U_i)$$

Where

C_i = Total production cost

R_1 = Cost of transportation

F_2 = Cost of fertilizer

F_3 = Cost of herbicides

F_4 = Cost of seeds

F_5 = Cost of labour

F_6 = Depreciation cost

Y_i = Output of maize (kg/ha)

The choice of Cobb Douglas is based on the fact that the methodology requires that the function be self-dual as in the case of cost function in which the analysis is based on.

The inefficiency model U_i is define by

$$U_i = \delta_0 + \delta_1 Z_{1i} + \delta_2 Z_{2i} + \delta_3 Z_{3i} + \delta_4 Z_{4i}$$

Where Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and Z_4 represents age, farming experience, farm size and literacy level. These socio-economic variables are included in the model to indicate their possible influence on the cost efficiency of the farmer.

The test for the presence of cost inefficiency using generalized likelihood-ratio statistics is given by $\lambda = 2l_n(H_0/H_A)$.

H_0 = The value of likelihood function in which parameters restriction specified by the null hypothesis H_0 , are imposed.

H_A = The value of the likelihood functions for the general frontier model.

The variance parameters are

$$\text{Sigma Squared } (\sigma^2) = \sigma^2_v = \sigma^2_u$$

$$\text{Gamma } (\gamma) = \sigma^2_u / \sigma^2_v + \sigma^2_u$$

Economics of scale (E_s) - Economics of scale may be defined in term of elasticity of cost with respect to output. Economics of scale prevail exist if $E_s > 1$. Diseconomies of scale exist if $E_s < 1$. In this case where $E_s = 1$, no economies of scale or diseconomies of scale exist. However in multi-product setting, economies of scale (E_s) is defined on those reduction on average cost when all output are increased proportionally holding all other input prices constant. Economics of scale is mathematically equivalent to the inverse of the sum of all the

elasticities of total production cost with respect to all output (Ogundari *et al*, 2006).

Results and Discussion

The finding on the costs and returns of maize production in the study area revealed that the total variable cost was N25, 954.18 which represents about 97% of the total cost of production while depreciation on fixed cost was N859.01 representing about 3% of the total cost. Hence the total cost (TC) of farming per hectare was N26, 813.19 (TVC + TFC). Total revenue, gross margin and farm income were N57, 052.97, N31, 098.79 and N30, 239.78 respectively. The average cost per kilogram shown that N21.08 was used to produce 1kg maize while the average revenue per kilogram shows that N44.86 was generated as revenue from selling 1kg of the maize produced. Return on naira invested by the Maize farmer's shows that for every one naira invested, N1.13 was gained. This means that 113% profit was made. This profit margin should attract financing from the lending institutions, because if maize farmers is funded with say N30, 000.00 at an interest rate of 18% the farmer will return the principal of N30, 000.00, interest of N5, 400.00 and retain N28, 500 (95%) as profit (Table 1).

Table 1 Average cost and returns on maize production

Variable	Value (N/Ha)
Total Variable Cost (TVC)	25, 954.18
Total Fixed Cost (TFC)	859.01
Total Cost of Production (TC)	26,813.19
Total Average Output (kg/ha)	1, 271.69
Average Cost per Kilogram	21.08
Average Revenue per Kilogram	44.86
Total Revenue (TR)	57, 052.97
Gross margin (GM = TR – TVC)	31, 098.79
NFI (GM – TVC)	30, 239.78
Return on naira invested (ROI)	1.13

Source: field survey 2009

The summary statistics of the variables for the frontier estimation in table 2 presents the sample mean and standard deviation for each of the

variables. The mean value of N24, 859.39 as total cost of producing 1,271.69kg of maize per hectare was obtained from the data analysis with a standard deviation of N11, 051.49. The large standard deviation conforms to the fact that most of the farmers operate at different scale of operation. Analysis of the cost variables of the farmers showed that labour accounts for about 40% of the total cost due to the fact that there is a reduction in a number of

household participation in farm operation since most farmers send their children to the city for proper education. Hence farmers depend on heavily on hired labour to do most of the farming operations. This justifies the cost of expended labour. Cost of fertilizer, herbicides and seed account for 26.83%, 19.52% and 4.39% of the total cost respectively. While transportation and depreciation cost account for 4.82%, and 3.46% of the total cost respectively.

Table2 Summary statistics of the variables in stochastic frontier model

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	% of TC
Total production cost (N)	24, 859.39	11, 051.49	
Cost of transportation (N)	1, 197.49	727.12	4.82
Cost of fertilizer (N)	6, 670.95	5, 250.93	26.83
Cost of herbicides (N)	4, 853.36	2, 244.83	19.52
Cost of seed (N)	1, 091.89	526.29	4.39
Cost of labour (N)	10, 077.35	8, 568.90	40.54
Depreciation cost (N)	859.01	640.03	3.46
Maize output (kg/ha)	1, 271.69	1, 838.81	
Age of the farmers (Years)	48.10	11.06	
Farming experience (Years)	24.31	13.05	
Farm size (ha)	4.42	2.00	
Literacy level (rating: 0 – 5)	2.35	2.04	

Source: Field Survey 2009

Variables representing the demographic characteristics of the farmers employed in the analysis of the determinant of cost efficiency include age of the farmers, farming experience and farm size and literacy level. The average age of the farmers was 48.10 meaning that the farmers are in their middle age (i.e. relatively young). The average farming experience was 24.31 years, implying the maize farmers has many years of experience and so should produce high output. Literacy level was rated 2.35 meaning that most of the farmers attended primary school and a bit of secondary education (i.e. relatively educated).

Maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters of the stochastic cost frontier model are presented in table 3. All the parameter estimate have the expected signs with the cost of transportation,

fertilizer, herbicides, seed, labour, annual depreciation and maize output are highly significant at 1% level meaning that these factor are significantly different from zero and thus are important in maize production. The cost elasticities with respect to all input variables used in the production analysis is are positive and imply that an increase in the cost of transportation, cost of fertilizer, cost of herbicides, cost of seed, cost of labour, annual depreciation cost and production (maize output in kg) increases total production cost by 0.03%, 1% increase in the cost of fertilizer will increase total cost by 0.07%, 1% increase in the cost of herbicide will increase total cost by 0.02%, 1% increase in the cost of seed will increase total cost by 0.2%, 1% increase in annual depreciation will increase the total cost by 0.10%; 1% increase in maize output will increase the total

production cost by 0.23%. however, labour cost, transportation cost and capital cost (cost of fertilizer, herbicides, seed and annual depreciation) are positive

implying that the cost function monotonically increases in input prices (i.e. increasing input prices in the same proportion).

Table 3 Maximum likelihood estimates of parameters of the Cobb Douglas frontier function for maize farmers in the study area.

Variables	Parameter	Estimated coefficient (t-ratio)
General model		
constant	β_0	1.712 ***(15.409)
Cost of transportation (N)	β_1	0.031 ***(3.575)
Cost of fertilizer (N)	β_2	0.072 ***(2.707)
Cost of Herbicide (N)	β_3	0.024 ***(2.402)
Cost of seed (N)	β_4	0.204 ***(4.361)
Cost of labour (N)	β_5	0.136 ***(5.729)
Depreciation cost (N)	β_6	0.104 ***(3.785)
Maize output (kg)	β_7	0.228 ***(5.902)
Cost elasticity		0.799
Inefficiency model		
Constant	δ_0	-0.546 (-0.600)
Age of farmers (Years)	δ_1	-0.119 ***(-3.011)
Farming experience (Years)	δ_2	0.194 ***(5.948)
Farm size (ha)	δ_3	-0.861 ***(-4.307)
Literacy level (rating 0 – 5)	δ_4	0.517 ***(2.914)
Variance parameters		
Sigma - Squared	σ^2	0.775 ***(3.955)
Gamma	γ	0.910 ***(27.549)
Log likelihood function	llf	136.593

Source: Field Survey 2009

*** Estimates are significant at 1% level

The estimated coefficient in the explanatory variables in the model is presented in table 3 for the cost inefficiency is of interest and has important implication. The negative coefficient for age and farm size implies the age of the farmers and the farm size in maize production are more cost efficient than the younger ones meaning that the age and farm size increases in the study area the cost inefficiency of the farmers decreases. This is in conformity with the assumption that farmers' age affects the production efficiency since the farmers different ages have different farm sizes.

The positive coefficient of literacy level indicates that farmers' level of cost efficiency tend to decline with education. This is in contradiction with the assumption that educational level of the farmers will have positive effect on the level of efficiency as the embody skill that can improve their overall efficiency.

The estimated gamma (γ) of 0.910 in the lower part of table 2 were highly significant at 1% level of the measurement error and other random disturbance, thus indicating that 91% of the variation in the total cost of production among the sampled farmers was

due to difference in their cost efficiencies. Sigma-Squared (σ^2) are on the other hand is 0.775 and is statistically significant at 1% level. Since the figure is significantly different from zero, it indicates a good fit and correctness of distributional form assumed for the composite error term.

Table 4 shows summary of cost efficiency scores for the maize farmers in the study area. Cost efficiency is estimated as $C_{EE} = \exp U_i$, the mean cost efficiency of the farmers was estimated as 1.04, meaning an average maize farmer has cost that are about 4% above the minimum defined by the frontier. In other words 4% of their costs are wasted relative to the practiced farms producing the same output (maize) and facing the same technology. The higher the value of C_{EE} the more inefficient the farmer is. However of frequencies of occurrence of the predicted cost efficiency between 1.00 and 1.05 representing about 88.4% of the sampled farmers implies that the majority of the farmers are efficient in producing a given level of output using cost minimizing input ratio which reflects the farmers' tendency to minimize resource wastage associated with production process from cost perspective.

Table 4 Cost efficiencies of the sampled maize farmers

Efficiency level	Frequency	Relative Efficiency	Percentage (%)
1.00 – 1.02	41		22.8
1.03 – 1.05	118		65.6
1.06 – 1.08	15		8.3
1.09 – 1.11	5		2.8
1.12 – 1.15	0		0.0
1.16 – 1.18	1		0.5
Total	180		100
Minimum		1.00	
Maximum		1.18	
Mean		1.04	
Mode		1.04	

Source: Field Survey 2009

The result of the hypothesis as given by correlation coefficient showed that fertilizer, herbicides and hired labour are highly significant at 1% level and positively related to maize output. This implies that increase in the amount used to these variables will lead to increase in maize output. Seed and family labour are however not significant.

Table 5 Correlation coefficient between maize output and input used by the farmers

Input	Correlation coefficient	Decision rule
Fertilizer	0.323 ***	Reject HO
Herbicide	0.412 ***	Reject HO
Seed	0.134	Accept HO
Hired labour	0.422 ***	Reject HO
Family labour	-0.047	Accept HO

*** Coefficient significant at 1% level
Source: Field Survey, 2009

The constraint identified militating against maize production in the study area were in table 4. The study revealed that 69% of the farmers were confronted with the problem of inadequate credit, 50% of the farmers could not use hybrid seed either because of lack of funds or they do not have access to it, 51% could not afford irrigation facilities either to complement for rain in time of drought or during dry season farming. Landform post constraint to 46% of the farmers which causes flooding and water logging giving room to water to cause damage to crops, 41% of the farmers are faced with the problem of pest and diseases which causes damage to the crops, 22% of the respondents are faced with the problem of inadequate farmland this is due to the problem of land tenure system being practiced in the study area. Lastly only 21% of the farmers have contact with extension agent occasionally.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

Summary; The study examines economics of scale and scale and cost efficiency in maize production in Ganye local government in Adamawa state. A multistage sampling technique was used to select 180 farmers in the study area. Data were collected and subjected to inferential statistics (OLS) and the stochastic frontier production model which was used to determine the relationship between the dependent variable (maize output), the independent variables

and the technical inefficiency in farmers operation in the study. A Cobb Douglas functional firm was used to impose the assumption that return to scale and economics of scale are equivalent measures if and only if the production function is homothetic.

Sigma (σ^2) was 0.077 which represents good fit and correctness of the distributional form assumed for the composite error term. Gamma (γ) was 0.910 which shows 91% of the variations in output are due to difference in the farmers' cost efficiency. Finding showed that 88.4% of the farmers were close to the frontier level achieving scores of about 4% lower in term of cost difference in relation to the best practiced technology. However, the level of observed cost efficiency has been showed to be significantly influenced by age and farm size. This means that as the farmers' age and farm sizes increases, there will be a corresponding increase in the ability of the farmers to efficiently allocate prices or cost to inputs used.

Table 6 Distribution of Respondents based on constraint s faced in maize production.

Constraints	Percentage (%)	Rank
Inadequate credit	69	1
Unavailability of irrigation facilities	51	2
Lack of improved seed	50	3
Land form	46	4
Disease and pest	41	5
Inadequate farmland	22	6
Inadequate extension contact	21	7
Total	100	

Multiple responses; Source: Field Survey 2009

Conclusion: In conclusion maize farming in the study area is profitable and economics of scale exist. The closeness of the average cost efficiency (C_{EE}) of 1.04 to unity is an indication that although farmers are small scale resource poor, they are efficient in the use of their resources and that any expansion in their present level of production will bring down the cost of production per output. The prevailing economics of scale obtained for the study is in accordance with

result of Ogundari *et al* (2006) that indicated higher relative efficiency for small farms.

Recommendation: based on the finding in the study area, the following are recommended.

- More effort should be intensified on the part of extension agent in educating the farmers so as to boost their efficiencies in maize production.
- The farmers should be encouraged to keep records also, they should be thought the recommended quantities of agrochemicals and improved seed to use on their farms in order to achieve optimum yield. This will help the farmers to make better farm plans in the future so as to increase output as well as profit.
- The useful policy recommendations made by agricultural researchers should be implemented by the government. This will go along way in contributing towards the achievement of self sufficiency in the nation.

References

- [1] Econ. Abdulai, A. and Huffman, W. Structural adjustment and Economic Efficiency Of rice farmers in Northern Ghana. *Develop. Cultural Change* 2000; 48(3):504 – 520 DOI: 10.1086/452608 <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu>.
- [2] Adebayo, A. A. And Tukur, A. I. *Adamawa in maps*. Paraclete Publishers, Yola, Nigeria. 1999 Pp 33-4
- [3] Aigner, D. I. C., Lovell, I. A. K. and Schmidt, P. Formation and estimation Stochastic frontier production function models” *Journals of econometrics* 1977, 6:21-37
- [4] Ajibefun, I. A., Battese, G. E. and Daramola, A. G. Determinant of technical efficiency in smallholders’ corps farming in Oyo state Nigeria. Application of frontier production function. *Quarterly journal of International Agriculture* 2002, 41(3):226-240
- [5] Akande, S. O. *Comparative cost and returns in maize production in Nigeria*. 1994, NISER Individual Research project Report, Ibadan: NISER.
- [6] Ali, M. and Byerlee, D. “Economic Efficiency of small farmers in changing World: A Survey of Recent Evidence”. *Journal of Development Studies* 1991 4: 1-27.
- [7] Battese, G. E. and Gorra, G. S. Estimation of production function model With Application to the pictorial zone of eastern Australia. *Australian journal of Agricultural Economics*. 1977,21: 169-179
- [8] Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. A model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in Stochastic frontier production for panel data. *Empirical Economics*, 1995, 20: 325-345.
- [9] Brovo-Ureta, Boris E. and Antonio Pinherro, E. “Efficiency Analysis of Developing Country agriculture: A review of frontier function *Agriculture and Resource Economics Review*. 1993, 22(1): 88-101.
- [10] Chambers, R. G. *Applied Production Analysis: A Dual Approach* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983
- [11] Farell, J. M. “Measurement of Productive Efficiency”. *Journal Royal Statistics*, 1957, 120, (part III); 253-290.ss
- [12] F.A.O. FAOSTAT 2003, <http://faostat.fao.org/default.htm>
- [13] Iken, J. E., Amusa, N. A. and Obatobu, V. O. Nutrient composition and Weight evaluation of small newly developed maize varieties in Nigeria. *Journal of food technology*, Africa (Kenya).2002, 7: 25-35
- [14] National Population Commission *Federal Republic of Nigeria official Gazette* Printed and published by the Federal Government Printer; Lagos Nigeria. 2007, No 24, Vol. 9
- [15] Ogundari, K. and Ojo, S. O. “The determinant of technical efficiency in Mixed Crop food production in Nigeria: A stochastic Approach”. *Proceeding of the 1st annual conference on Development in Agriculture and Biological science* 21st April, 2005. School of Agriculture Nigeria. 2005, Pp159-164.
- [16] Ogundari, K., Ojo, S. O. and Ajibefun, I. A. Economics of scale and cost Efficiency in small scale maize production: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of central European Agriculture*, 2006, (1): 15-26
- [17] Ojo, S. O., Factor productivity in maize production in Ondo state Nigeria. *Applied Tropical Agriculture*. 2000, 15 (1): 57-65.
- [18] Ojo, S. O., Improving Labour Productivity and Technical Efficiency in Food Crop Production. A panacea for Poverty Reduction in Nigeria. *Journal Food Agriculture and Environment*. 2004, 2 (2): 227-231
- [19] Ogunsumi, I. O., Ewuola, S. O. and Daramola, A. G., Socio-economic Impact Assessment of maize production technology on farmers’ welfare in south west, Nigeria. *Journal of Central European Agriculture*, 2005, 6(1): 15-26.
- [20] Oyewa, I. O., Rauf, M. O., Ogunwole, F. and Balagun, S. O. Determinant Of Maize Production among Maize Farmers in Ogbomosho South Local Government in Oyo state. *Medwell Agricultural Journals* 2009, 4(3) 144-149.

7/7/2010