Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies

ISSN(print): 2644-0490, ISSN(online): 2644-0504

Volume 4 Issue 03 March 2021

Article DOI: 10.47191/jefms/v4-i3-03, Impact Factor: 6.228

Page No.- 120-127

Technical Inefficiency Determinants in Potato Production: The case of Potato Farmers in Central Highlands of Ethiopia

Daniel Hailu

Department of Agricultural Economics, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), P.O. Box 2003, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT: The study identified the factors that cause variation in the level of efficiency in potato production. The study used household level cross sectional data collected in 2015/16 from 196 sample farmers selected by multistage sampling technique. For the data collection, a personally administered structured questionnaire was used. In the analyses, descriptive statistics, a stochastic frontier model (SFM) and a two-limit Tobit regression model were employed. Tobit model revealed that technical efficiency was positively and significantly affected by education, land tenure status, extension service, credit and soil fertility whereas variables such as sex of household head, age of household head, farm size and land fragmentation affected it negatively. Therefore the study suggested the need for policies to discourage land fragmentation and promote education, extension visits, access to credit and soil fertility for improvement in technical efficiency.

KEYWORDS: Potato, Smallholder, Technical efficiency, Determinants, Ethiopia.

1. INTRODUCTION

Potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) is the third most important food crop after rice and wheat for human consumption and over a million people on earth eat potatoes (CIP, 2014). Potato is short cycle crops (3 to 4 months), and thus well suited to the double cropping seasons particularly the rain-fed system (Nteranya Sanginga and Adiel Mbabu, 2015).

In 2007 the potato production reached a record of 325 million metric tons becoming the first non-grain commodity for the humanity (FAO, 2009). However demand for both food and energy is rising and it is expected to keep the same trend with increases in global population and average income (Lobell et al., 2009).

Efficiency measurements are carried out using frontier methodologies, which shift the average response functions to the maximum output or to the efficient firm. Efficiency measurements involve a comparison of actual performance with optimal performance located on relevant frontier. Since the true frontier is unknown, an empirical approximation is required.

Determinants of Technical Efficiency

Empirical studies suggest that most under developed and developing countries are still facing the problem of high poverty levels. Most farmers in these countries practice subsistence farming with low productivity. Farmers use different levels of production inputs and management depending on their infrastructural facility and socio economic, institutional and environmental conditions. This ultimately results in variability in the inefficiencies of potato production. The ability of a country to achieve growth in agricultural productivity and output depends on its ability to use the available resources efficiently and make an efficient choice among alternative paths of technical changes (Mulat, Said & Jayne, 1997; Xu, X. & Jeffrey, 1998).

Farmers lack access or less information on efficiency, and low literacy levels limiting interpretation of such information to guide them in commercial production. Further, less access to such information may be attributed to the few studies carried out in these areas. In order to realize increased production and efficiency, small-scale farmers in developing countries need to efficiently utilize the limited resources accessed for improved food security and farm income generation (Amos, 2007).

The findings indicated that, productivity can change due to differences in production technology, differences in the efficiency of the production process and differences in the environment in which production takes place. This suggests attention to productivity gains arising from efficient use of existing technologies is justified. From this point view, it is interesting to search the sources of the inefficiency and to identify the determinants.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. The Study Area

The study was conducted in Welmera district 29 km away from the capital city of Addis Ababa in central highlands of Ethiopia. The district is known in potato production and source of potato supply for Addis Ababa and other urban markets. The area ranges in elevation from 2,000 to 3,000 masl.

2.2. Sampling Techniques

Multi stage sampling techniques was used. The district was selected purposively because potato is a common crop in the area. In the district six villages were selected purposively based on share of potato cultivated land and potato farmers in the district. Finally, respondents were selected in proportion with the frame by using systematic random sampling techniques.

2.3. Sample Size Determination

The sample size of potato producers was computed by Statistics Canada (2010): that is a step-by-step approach where, first an initial sample size is calculated and then it is adjusted for the population, design effect and the response rate. Based on the formulation, a sample size of 196 respondents was selected through random sampling. The sample was supposed to contain potato farmers.

2.4. Data Type and Sources

Data was obtained from both primary and secondary sources using appropriate data collection instruments. Primary data was collected from 2015/16 cropping season using personally administered structured questionnaires. Secondary data was gathered from country's statistical report, crop variety register, annual reports, research papers, website, books and unpublished reports.

2.5. Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive and Econometric analysis were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were employed to describe the demographic, socio-economic and institutional characteristics of the potato farmers. A stochastic frontier model (SFM) and a two-limit Tobit regression model were employed to derive efficiency scores for the potato producers and to determine technical inefficiency factors respectively. The data was analyzed using frontier 4.1c program and STATA software.

A Stochastic Frontier Model (SFM)

A Parametric Stochastic Frontier Production Function was used to assess technical efficiency of potato producers in the study area. A Cobb-Douglas frontier production function which has self-dual characteristics was used to derive efficiency scores for the potato producers. The double log form of the Cobb-Douglas production function model proved to be a superior alternative on theoretical and econometric grounds.

The specific Cobb-Douglas production model estimated is given by:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 * \prod_{i=1}^{6} X_i^{\beta_i} * e^{(v_i - u_i)} \quad \text{---------- (1)}$$

By transforming it into double log-linear form;

$$\ln Y_i = \ln \beta_o + \beta_i \sum_{i=1}^{6} \ln X_i + (v_i - u_i) \quad \text{---------- (2)}$$

Where, Y_i - represents potato output and X_i - represents potato production inputs by i^{th} farmer. Whereas β_0 & β_i - are the regression parameters to be estimated and ln - is natural logarithm. The term $v_i - u_i$ is a composed error term where v_i represents randomness (or statistical noise) and u_i represents technical inefficiency.

From the error term component ($v_i - u_i$), v_i is a two sided ($-\infty < v < \infty$) normally distributed random error ($v \sim N[0, \sigma^2 v]$) that represents the stochastic effects outside the farmer's control. (example weather, natural disasters etc), measurement errors, & other statistical noise while U_i is a one-sided ($u_i \geq 0$) efficiency component which is independent of v_i and is normally distributed with zero mean and a constant variance ($\sigma^2 u$) allowing the actual production fall below the frontier but without attributing all short falls in output from the frontier as inefficiency.

Following Khan and Saeed (2011) and Bealu et al. (2013) the stochastic frontier production functions model will be specified as follows:

$$Y_i = f(X_i; \alpha_i) + \varepsilon_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \quad \text{---------- (3)}$$

Whereby Y_i is the output of farmer i, X_i are the input variables, α_i are production coefficients and ε is the error term that is composed of two elements, that is: $\varepsilon_i = v_i - u_i$

The technical efficiency (TE) of an individual farm is defined in terms of the ratio of the observed output (Y_i) to the corresponding frontier output (Y_i*), conditioned on the level of inputs used by the farm and mathematically expressed as:

$$TE = \frac{Y_i}{Y_i^*} = \frac{E(Y_i / u_i, X_i)}{E(Y_i / u_i = 0, X_i)} = e^{-[E(u_i/e_i)]} \quad \text{---------- (4)}$$

A two-limit Tobit regression model

The determinants of technical efficiency were estimated using a two-limit Tobit model with the dependent variable, as the technical efficiency indices.

Following Amemiya (1981) and Endrias et al., (2013), the two-limit Tobit model was defined as;

$$Y_{i\,TE}^{*} = \delta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_j z_{ij} + u_i \quad \text{---------- (5)}$$

Where Y_i^* is latent variable representing the efficiency scores, δ_0, δ_1,..., δ_n are parameters to be estimated, and TE is, technical efficiency of the i^{th} farmer. Z_i - demographic, socioeconomic and institutional factors that affect efficiency level. And u_i - an error term with mean zero and variance δ^2 ($u_i \sim IN(0, \delta^2)$) and farm specific efficiency scores for the smallholder potato producers range between zero and one.

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Y_i^* \geq 1 \\ Yi^*, & \text{if } 0 < Y_i^* < 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } Y_i^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{---------- (6)}$$

Two-limit Tobit model allows for censoring in both tails of the distribution (Greene, 2003). The log likelihood that is based on the doubly censored data and built up from sets of the two - limit Tobit model is given by;

$$\ln L = \sum_{Y_i = L_{oi}} \ln \varphi \left[\frac{l_{oi} - X'_i \beta}{\sigma} \right] + \sum_{y_i = y_i^*} \ln . \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi \left[\frac{Y_i - X'_i \beta}{\sigma} \right] + \sum_{Y_i = l_{1i}} \ln \left[1 - \phi \left(\frac{l_{1i - X'_i \beta}}{\sigma} \right) \right] \text{---------- (7)}$$

Where $L_{oi} = 0$ (lower limit) and $L_{1i} = 1$ (upper limit) where **ϕ** and φ are normal and standard density functions.

The Marginal Effects

The regression coefficients of the two-limit tobit regression model cannot be interpreted like traditional regression coefficients that give the magnitude of the marginal effects of change in the explanatory variables on the expected value of the dependent variable.

The marginal effects of changes in explanatory variables from Tobit regression analysis were computed following the procedure proposed by McDonald and Moffitt (1980) and later developed by Gould et al. (1989). McDonald and Moffitt showed that a change in the independent variable x has three effects:

(1) It affects the conditional mean of y in the positive part of the distribution.

(2) It affects the probability that the observation will fall in that part of the distribution.

(3) The sum of both effects gives the unconditional effect.

1) The unconditional expected value of the dependent variable: The marginal effects for the unconditional expected value of the dependent variable, E(y*), where y* = max (a, min (y, b)), where a is the lower limit for left censoring and b is the upper limit for right censoring.

$$\frac{\partial E(y)}{\partial X_j} = \left[\varphi(z_u) - \varphi(z_{L)} \right] . \frac{\partial E(y^*)}{\partial X_j} + \frac{\partial \left[\varphi(z_u) - \varphi(z_L) \right]}{\partial X_j} + \frac{\partial \left[1 - \varphi(z_u) \right]}{\partial X_j} \quad \text{---------- (8)}$$

2) The expected value of the dependent variable conditional upon being between the limits: The influence of explanatory variables on the expected value of the dependent variable conditional on it being larger than the lower bound. The marginal effects for the expected value of the dependent variable conditional on being uncensored, E(y | a<y<b), where a is the lower limit for left censoring and b is the upper limit for right censoring.

$$\frac{\partial E(y^*)}{\partial X_j} = \beta_m \cdot \left[1 + \frac{\{z_L\phi(z_L) - z_u\phi(z_u)\}}{\{\varphi(z_u) - \varphi(z_L)\}}\right] - \left[\frac{\{\phi(z_L) - \phi(z_u)\}^2}{\{\varphi(z_u) - \varphi(z_L)\}^2}\right] \quad \text{---------- (9)}$$

3) The probability of being between the limits: The influence of explanatory variables on the probability of dependent variable to fall in the uncensored part of the distribution.

$$\frac{\partial[\varphi(z_u) - \varphi(z_L)]}{\partial X_j} = \frac{\beta_m}{\sigma}[\phi(z_L) - \phi(z_u)] \quad \text{---------- (10)}$$

Where, ϕ(.) = the cumulative normal distribution, φ(.) = the normal density function, $Z_L = \frac{-X'_i\beta}{\sigma}$ and $Z_u = \frac{(1 - X_i\beta)}{\sigma}$ are standardized variables that came from the likelihood function given the limits of y* and σ = standard deviation of the model.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

The majority (86.2%) of sampled respondents were male headed households. Sampled age of respondents was aged between 18 to 73 years. Most of the sampled HHHs were relatively old. Farmer's experience in potato activities were ranged from one to thirty years. The HHs with small household sizes had one person, while those with large HH sizes had 13 persons, with an average of six members per household. About 52.5% of the total sampled HHs had at least 6 persons in the household.

This indicates that majority of the farmers depend on farm activities to generate income. Average livestock holding per household in the study area was 8.7 TLU (Tropical Livestock Unit). The average land holding size per household in the study area was 2.4 ha. The majority of the farmers (58.2%) own below average land holding size (2.4 ha). 48.8 percent of total operated area was under owner-operated land. On the other hand, contracted land (either cash rented, sharecropped, gifted or borrowed) were observed to operate on 82.1 ha which covered 51.2 percent substantially larger than the average size of owner-operated land.

A majority of the sampled HHs (91.8%) did not access any credits for potato production and marketing. 80.6% of the respondents had access to extension services on potato production in the scheme. The results of this study show that only 27% of the farmers in the study area received off-farm income. The average number of years in formal education is 5 years, which is primary education. 16.8% of the HH heads having not attended any formal school at all. The number of plots cultivated by a household ranges from one to eleven. Fragmentation of land holdings is severe and four plots are cultivated per household. Land quality measure was rated by farmers' perceptions of the quality of their plots. 89.8% of the cultivated area in the study area reported better quality soil with 37.8% and 52% for highly and moderately fertile soil respectively.

3.2. Empirical Results

MLE of the Variance Parameters

The maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) of the Cobb-Douglas based stochastic production function was specified to determine the possible relationships between the production of potato and inputs used. The results of MLE of variance parameters explain that variance parameter gamma (γ) is the ratio of variance of farm specific technical efficiency to the total variance of output and has a value 0.86 which shows that out of total variation in potato production 86 percent variation is due to technical inefficiency u_i.

Table 1: MLE of the Variance Parameters

Input Variables	coefficient	standard-error	t-ratio
Plot Size	0.21416064	0.56909651	0.37631691
Amount of seed	0.19014809	0.44986308	0.42267992
Amount of fertilizer	0.14872105	0.42500346	0.34992904
Amount of chemicals	0.77022855	0.20334298	0.37878295
Oxen days	0.23933915	0.82721297	0.28933196
Labor days	0.19641556	0.58023390	0.33851101
sigma-squared	0.53994401	0.87086913	0.33851101
Gamma	0.86325026	0.60872807	0.14181213
log likelihood function = -0.13383290			

The estimated values of output elasticities for all inputs are positive and significant influence on potato output growth.

Technical Efficiency Level

The mean TE of sample households during the survey period was 62.6%. The results of the efficiency scores indicate that there were wide ranges of differences in TE among potato producing farmers. Results indicate that there is a considerable amount of efficiency variation among potato producer farmers, implying significant potential in potato production that can be developed.

Factors Influencing Technical Efficiency

The results obtained from the first stage estimations indicated that the average efficiency scores were low and there existed efficiency variations among farmers. The TE estimates derived from the model were regressed on factors that explain variations in efficiency across farm households using Tobit model (Table 2).

T**able 2: Tobit regression (determinant factors in Technical efficiency)**

Variables	Coefficient (TE)	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|
Sex of household head	-0.0340026***	0.005815	-5.850	0.000
Age of household head	-0.010998***	0.000387	-28.440	0.000
Education level of household head	0.0047574***	0.000721	6.600	0.000
Size of household head	0.0002115	0.000443	0.480	0.634
Land holding	-0.0423106***	0.004445	-9.520	0.000
Land tenure status	0.0075885**	0.003761	2.020	0.045
Land fragmentation	-0.0023509**	0.000920	-2.560	0.011
Tropical livestock unit (TLU)	0.0007838*	0.000473	1.660	0.099
Of farm income	0.0001235	0.000168	0.730	0.464
Extension contact	0.0051273***	0.000832	6.170	0.000
Credit service	0.0008965***	0.000283	3.170	0.002
Soil fertility status	0.0114919**	0.005175	2.220	0.028

Note: *** Significant at 1%, ** Significant at 5% and * Significant at 10%

Sex of household head showed a negative effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 1% level. Female-headed households would have better opportunities to carry out frequent follow up and supervision of the farm activities on their plot and female farmers are more likely to attend meetings and adopt the best production practices. The result was similar with that of (Tewodros, 2001) and (Susan, 2011).

Age of household head showed a negative effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 1% level. The finding is attributed to the fact that older potato farmers in the study area are relatively more resistant to adopt new practices and better technologies, instead they prefer to hold to the traditional farming methods thus become more technically inefficient compared to their younger counterparts. Younger farmers were relatively more efficient than older farmers. This is because younger farmers are comparatively more educated than the older farmers and had more contacts with extension agent, plot demonstration and agricultural meetings. The finding was consistent with (Abdur Rouf, 2012), (Bealu et al., 2013) and (K.W Sibiko et al., 2013).

Education level of the household head showed a positive effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 1% level. More educated producers are more efficient in their acquisition and processing of technical knowledge. This may lead to better assessment of the importance and complexities of good farming decision, including efficient use of inputs and take up improved technologies faster because they understand the benefits associated with the technology, hence increasing their efficiency. Thus more years of schooling of the household head would lead to higher TE. Daniel (2009), Tewodros (2001) and Khan and Saeed (2011) found for the same.

Farm Land size had a negative effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 1% level. This finding suggests that increased larger farm size diminishes the timeliness of input use and farmers may encounter more problems in applying farm inputs at the right time; hence an inefficient use of farm inputs. Perhaps, timely and appropriate agricultural operation on larger land size given the traditional technology may not be effective which leads to higher level of inefficiency. Similar findings were obtained by (Abdur Rouf, 2012) and (Essa, 2011).

Land Tenure Status: Farmer ownership to land related positively to technical efficiency and it was significant at 5% level. This was happened due to comparatively more inputs use in owner operators than other tenure arrangement which caused higher yield obtained in owner operators compared to other tenure arrangement. Farmer whose cultivated on his own land will economically

efficient because the tax that farmer paying is lower than the land rent the farmer have to pay. The increasing of production cost will imply to the decreasing of economic efficiency. In contrast, tenant cultivation is inefficient because of the adverse effect of tenure insecurity on long term investments. Abdur Rouf (2012) and Riatania Lubis (2014) found for the same.

Land Fragmentation had a negative effect on TE of the potato farms as was hypothesized and it was significant at 5% level. The results indicate fragmented farms create difficulties in oxen and labor use affecting negatively and significantly. Larger fragmentation of plots which are widely scattered made difficult for farmers to work on all their fields at the same time. Having so many fields, however, reduces the labor and other resources invested by farmers particularly in their distant fields. Available organic materials, such as manure and crop residues, are used only on fields nearest the homestead. Besides being difficult to reach (many fields are over 60 minutes walking from the home), the far distant fields are also difficult to guard against incursion by grazing cattle. Households nearer to plot have better chance of managing and seeing growing of potato which in turn will improve potato productivity. This is the same result with that of (Essa, 2011) and (Erdal, 2010).

Livestock Ownership (TLU) had a positive effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 1% level. Farmers who owned a large number of livestock's were technically more efficient than those who owned less number of livestock's in the production of potato. This is because livestock provides a working power (oxen for draught power), manure fertilizer and is a source of income that can be used to purchase the necessary agricultural inputs, avoids poor and late land preparation. Endrias et al. (2013) and Saulos (2015) found for the same.

Access to Credit had a positive effect on TE at 1% significant level. The positive and significant impact of credit on TE implies that credit availability enables farmers to make timely purchases of inputs that they cannot provide otherwise from their own resources by overcoming liquidity constraints which may affect their ability to apply inputs and implement farm management decisions on time. This result is consistent with (Khan and Saeed, 2011) and (Obare et al, 2010).

Extension Contact had a positive effect on TE of the potato farms at 1% significant level. Furthermore, such farmers respond fast to new technologies and appreciate correct management practices like timely planting and weeding, the correct amount of fertilizer to be applied, correct seed rate and general management of the farm. Therefore, households who receive regular extension visits by extension workers appear to be more technically and economically efficient than their counterparts. The result is consistent with (Daniel, 2009) and (Bealu et al., 2013).

Soil Fertility had a positive effect on TE of the potato farms and it was significant at 5% level. This implies that farmers with fertile farm were more efficient than farmers with infertile farm. This is due to the fact that a farmer holding infertile soil needs further efforts in terms of inputs and input costs to conserve the soil for better production. The result is consistent with that of (Alemayehu, 2010) and (Ruth Magreta, 2011).

The Marginal Effect Analysis

The estimated parameters on the inefficiency model presented in Table 4.10 only indicate the direction of the effects that the variables have on efficiency levels. The results from the Tobit model were subjected to post estimation test using marginal effect analysis in order to estimate the trivial change from each factor that influences TE. Quantification of the marginal effects of these variables is important in order to estimate the change that will occur with respect to a change in one unit of that variable. Table 3.

Table 3: The marginal effects of change in explanatory variables (TE)

Variables	∂ E (y)	∂ E (y^*)
Sex of household head	-0.03191	-0.02611
Age of household head	-0.01022	-0.00841
Education level of household head	0.00437	0.00352
Size of household head	0.00018	0.00015
Land holding	-0.01227	-0.01015
Land tenure status	0.00715	0.00585
Land fragmentation	-0.00219	-0.00179
Tropical livestock unit (TLU)	0.00074	0.00060
Of farm income	0.00011	0.00009
Extension contact	0.00473	0.00388
Credit service	0.00083	0.00068
Soil fertility status	0.01060	0.00864

The result shows that a change in the dummy variable representing the sex of household head from (0=F, 1=M), in the age of household head, in farm size and in the land fragmentation in an increasing order would decrease the probability of a farmer being technically efficient by about 3.19%, 1.02%, 1.23% and 0.22% respectively and the mean level of TE by about 2.61%, 0.84%, 1.02% and 0.18% respectively.

A unit change in the educational level of the household head, in land tenure arrangement (0=rental, 1=owner), in number agricultural extension contact, in utilization of credit and in the dummy variable representing the soil fertility of the plot (0 = infertile land, 1= fertile land) and number of livestock owned in an increasing order would increase the probability of a farmer to be technically efficient by 0.44%, 0.72%, 0.47%, 0.08% and 1.06% respectively and the expected value TE by 0.35%, 0.59%, 0.39%, 0.07% and 0.86% respectively.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Ethiopia has high potential for potato production and consumption. However, production does not meet the demand because of low productivity, despite a lot of research and development efforts made on high yielding varieties. In Ethiopia, 36 improved potato varieties were released since 1987 through its research centers. However, national average yields are still far below attainable yields. Farmers use different levels of production inputs and management depending on their infrastructural facility and socio economic, institutional and environmental conditions. The study observed that efficiency of potato farmers varied due to the presence of inefficiency effects in potato production. Technical efficiency was positively and significantly affected by education, land tenure status, extension service, credit and soil fertility whereas variables such as sex of household head, age of household head, farm size and land fragmentation affected it negatively. Therefore the study suggested the need for policies to discourage land fragmentation and promote education, extension visits, access to credit and soil fertility for improvement in technical efficiency.

REFERENCES

1) Abdur Rouf Sarkar Md. 2012. A Study On Economic Efficiency And Sustainability of Wheat Production In Selected Areas of Dinajpur District. M. Sc Thesis. Bangladesh Agricultural University. 149p.
2) Alemayehu Ethiopia Derege 2010. Analysis of Factors Affecting the Technical Efficiency of Coffee Producers In Jimma Zone: A Stochastic Frontier Analysis. M. Sc Thesis. Addis Ababa University. 110p.
3) Amemiya, T. 1981. Qualitative Response Models: A Survey. *Journal of Economic Literature* 19: 1483-1536.
4) Amos T.T. 2007. An Analysis of Productivity and Efficiency of Small holder Cocoa Farmers in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 15(2): 127-133.
5) Bealu Tukela, Endrias Geta, and Tadesse Ababu 2013. Factors Affecting Economic Efficiency In Maize Production: The Case of Boricha Woreda In Sidama Zone, Southern Ethiopia. 28p.
6) CIP. 2014. Potato. International Potato Center. Available at http://cipotato.org/potato (accessed on 29 January 2014).
7) Daniel O. Nyagaka 2009. Analysis of Production Efficiency in Irish Potato Production in Kenya: The Case of Nyandarua North District. M. Sc Thesis. Egerton University.
8) Endrias Geta, Ayalneh Bogale, Belay Kassa And Eyasu Elias 2013. Productivity And Efficiency Analysis of Smallholder Maize Producers In Southern Ethiopia. 15p.
9) Erdal Dagistan 2010. Determination of technical efficiency in wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*) production of Turkey: A case study of Cukurova region. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment* 8(2): 354-358.
10) Essa C. Mussa, Gideon A. Obare, Ayalneh Bogale., Franklin P. Simtowe 2011. Economic efficiency of smallholder major crop production in the central highlands of Ethiopia. 15p.
11) FAO. 2009. New light on a hidden treasure. FAO, Rome. 148 p.
12) Gould, B., W. Saup and R. Klemme 1989. Conservation tillage: the role of farm and operator characteristics and the perception of soil erosion. *Land Economics*, 65(2):167-182.
13) Greene, W.H., 2003. Econometric Analysis, 5th ed. Pearson Education Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. 1024p.
14) K.W. Sibiko, J.K. Mwangi, E.O. Gido, O.A. Ingasia, B.K. Mutai 2013. Allocative efficiency of smallholder common bean producers in Uganda: *International Journal of Development and Sustainability.* 2(2): 640-652.
15) Khan. H and Saeed. I 2011. Measurement of Technical, Allocative and Economic Efficiency of Tomato Farms in Northern Pakistan. *International Conference on Management, Economics and Social Sciences. 459-468.*

16) Lobell, D.B., Cassman, K.G., Field, C.B. 2009. Crop Yield gaps: their importance, magnitudes, and causes. Ann. Rev. Environ. Resour. 34, 179-204.
17) Mcdonald J.F. Moffitt R.A. 1980. The use of Tobit Analysis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 62(2): 318-321.
18) Minister of Industry 2010. Survey Methods and Practices, *Statistics Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6. 396p.
19) Mulat, D., Said, A. & Jayne, T.S. 1997. Promoting fertilizer use in Ethiopia: The implications of improving grain market performance, input market efficiency, and farm management. Grain Market Research Project, Ethiopia. 45p.
20) Nteranya Sanginga and Adiel Mbabu 2015. An Action Plan for African Agricultural Transformation ''Root and Tuber Crops (Cassava, Yam, Potato and Sweet Potato)''. *Feeding Africa* 26p.
21) Obare G. A, Daniel O. Nyagaka Wilson N. and Samuel M. 2010. Are Kenyan smallholders allocatively efficient? Evidence from Irish potato producers in Nyandarua North district. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics* 2(3):78-85.
22) Riatania Lubis, Arief D., Mangara T. and Handewi P. 2014. Technical, Allocative and Economic Efficiency of Pineapple Production in West Java Province, Indonesia. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science* 7(6):18-23.
23) Ruth Magreta 2011. Economic Efficiency of Rice Production in Smallholder Irrigation Schemes: A Case of Nkhate Irrigation Scheme in Southern Malawi. M. Sc Thesis. University of Malawi Bunda College. 84p
24) Saulos Jack Chakwera 2015. A survey on Technical, allocative, and economic efficiency of maize production in Ethiopia using the parametric stochastic frontier production function. International Scholars Journals 3(6): 237-245.
25) Susan C. 2011. Technical and Allocative Efficiency of Smallholder Maize Farmers in Zambia. M. Sc Thesis. University of Zambia. 54p.
26) Tewodros Aragie 2001. Farm Household Technical Efficiency: A Stochastic Frontier Analysis. A Study of Rice Producers in Mardi Watershed in the Western Development Region of Nepal. M. Sc Thesis. University of Norway. 57p.
27) Xu, X. & Jeffrey, S. 1998. Efficiency and technical progress in traditional and modern agriculture: evidence from rice production in China. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 18: 157-165.