

# Original Research Article

## Risk Preference Responses to Fertilizer Expenditures: A Case of Maize Smallholder Farmers in Iringa and Arusha Regions, in Tanzania

### Abstract

Initiatives have been tested to improve usage and expenditures on inorganic fertilizers, still, most of them did not yield the expected results particularly in highly maize-growing highlands. This study aims to evaluate usage of inorganic fertilizers and the influence of maize farmers' risk preferences on expenditure in inorganic fertilizers in the Iringa and Arusha regions. Data used were adopted from an Agronomic Panel Survey (APS) from 129 maize farmers' household heads (HHs), randomly selected within a spatial sampling frame in the maize-growing regions of the Southern and Northern highlands of Tanzania. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Tobit model. Results revealed that the majority of maize farmers (64%) did not apply inorganic fertilizers on maize plots. Results further showed statistical significance for the Arusha region ( $p < 0.001$ ), non-schooling ( $p < 0.05$ ), primary education (0.01), ordinary secondary education ( $p < 0.05$ ), number of plots ( $p < 0.05$ ) and size of the maize plot ( $p < 0.001$ ) in predicting inorganic fertilizer expenditures when Tobit model was estimated. Nevertheless, risk-preferred maize farmers were statistically significant in influencing fertilizer expenditure when both highlands were included. The study recommends a model comprising risk preferences, geographical factors and household characteristics in studying farmers' decisions on expenditure of inorganic fertilizers in respective regions and districts to uncover the location specificity and improve maize production.

**Keywords:** Risk preferences, inorganic fertilizer expenditures, inorganic fertilizer use, maize smallholders

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Agriculture in Sub-Saharan African (SSA) has to cope with large temporal variability in climatic conditions and low inorganic fertilizer use to improve crop yield, production, productivity and profitability. Inadequate use of inorganic fertilizers in SSA might be due to low purchasing power as well as variable decisions on the amount of money spent on purchasing inorganic fertilizers. Farmers' decisions are constrained by uncertainties affecting input investment outcomes (Cooper *et al.*, 2008, Charnes *et al.*, 2013, De Brauw and Eozenou, 2014, Holden, 2018). These decisions are mostly dictated by the personal characteristics and risk preferences of farmers (Sanou, 2015, Liverpool-Tasie *et al.*, 2019b, Mukasa, 2018, Liverpool-Tasie *et al.*, 2019a, Arslan *et al.*, 2020, Kemeze *et al.*, 2020, Bongole, 2021, Mwaijande *et al.*, 2023). A maize farmer's decision on how much to spend on inorganic fertilizer, under variable biophysical crop production conditions may determine the maize production outcome and later influence the crop production goals

**Comment [WU1]:** You are utilized cross-section data or panel data? Just make it clear, it says something on pp 5

**Comment [WU2]:** Remove it in abstract no need of abbreviation

**Comment [WU3]:** Remove it

**Comment [WU4]:** The result of what? Just fey What about user and non-user?

**Comment [WU5]:** This variable is not clear?

**Comment [WU6]:** Scientifically the conclusion part requires more effort of you. Do on that.

**Comment [WU7]:** It is better if you computed alphabetically

**Comment [WU8]:** reference

**Comment [WU9]:** old citation

Smallholder farmers in Tanzania like in other SSA countries have limited use of organic and inorganic fertilizers (Liverpool-Tasie *et al.*, 2019b, Senkoro *et al.*, 2017, Lobullu *et al.*, 2019) attributed to low maize yields due to inadequate cash expenditure in inorganic fertilizer, (Morris, 2007, Khan *et al.*, 2014). Magrini and Vigani (2016) reported a low percentage of inorganic fertilizer use in maize cultivation among agroecological zones of Tanzania. Some of the factors that contributed to low use and expenditure on fertilizer were the unavailability of extension services, the absence of on-farm trials, and variable rainfall. Variations in fertilizer use and money spent on inorganic fertilizers displayed maize yield variability. In addition, maize smallholder farmers in Tanzania face challenges in making decisions on inorganic fertilizer use and money to be invested in purchasing inorganic fertilizer. Farmers' choices comprise multiple objectives in risky environments prominently determined by household heads (Bezabih and Sarr, 2012). These decisions largely depend on the behavior of risk preference.

Comment [WU10]: old citation

Comment [WU11]: Reference

Comment [WU12]: Reference

This study is focusing on the Arusha and Iringa regions as representative of the Northern and Southern highlands of Tanzania respectively. Northern and Southern highlands zones are the main production areas of maize in the country, with Southern highlands being the largest producer (Cochrane and D'Souza, 2015, Suleiman and Kurtz, 2015). However, the average maize yield in the country is still very low, estimated at 2.2 tonnes per hectare (URT, 2018). Yet, there are initiatives tested in previous studies to improve inorganic fertilizer use and expenditures aiming at enhancing maize yield in the country, still, low fertilizer expenditure and maize yield are stated. The relationships between maize farmers' risk preferences and expenditures on inorganic fertilizers are among scarcely studied aspects in Tanzania, particularly in major maize-growing areas. The present study initially described the status of soil fertility of maize in the study regions and later evaluated the influence of risk preferences of households (HHs) on money invested in inorganic fertilizer. Among the outputs of the study, decision support advice that would contribute to the amendment of microeconomic policies and analytical studies on inorganic fertilizer use and expenditures in boosting the maize subsector in Tanzania will be provided.

Comment [WU13]: Make it clear name

### 1.1 Risk and maize production in Tanzania

In Tanzania, agriculture is typically rain-fed and involves smallholder farmers with less than 3 ha per farmer (Anandajayasekeram *et al.*, 2007; URT, 2018). The maize cropping areas frequently have depleted soils with low nutrient contents, negative nutrient balances, and little or no nutrient replenishment. Nutrient depletion leads to low production, food insecurity, and poverty (Khan *et al.*, 2014). On top of biophysical constraints, socio-economic factors, such as farmer and farm characteristics; are believed to influence farmers' decisions on crop productivity but their effects are poorly quantified. Socio-economic factors include the risk preferences of smallholder maize farmers. These preferences may vary among farmers and they may determine the choice of crop rotations, expenditures in farm or off-farm income, and use of improved seeds and fertilizers, hence, affecting crop management and productivity.

Comment [WU14]: What are them?

Since little is known about the decision-making of maize smallholder farmers under risky conditions, more information on the interaction between maize farmers' risk preferences and farmer and farm resources in respective regions is needed. The importance of the risk aspect in decision-making necessitates this study.

## 1.2 Theoretical and conceptual framework

Relying on expected utility theory (EUT), (Bernoulli, 1738, von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1947, von Neumann and Morgenstern, 2007, Briggs, 2016), human individuals can be grouped into risk preference classes based on their decision-making abilities as defined by expected utility functions. EUT describes the relationship between *acts*, *states*, and *outcomes* in studying an individual's attitude toward risk as;

*The expected utility of an act is the weighted average of the utilities of each of its possible outcomes where the utility of an outcome measures the extent to which that outcome is preferable to the alternatives.*

$$E(U) = P_1 \cdot U(W_1) + P_2 \cdot U(W_2) + \dots + P_n \cdot U(W_n) \dots \dots \dots \text{(equation 1)}$$

$$E(U) = \sum P_i \cdot U(W_i) \dots \dots \dots \text{(equation 2)}$$

where;

$U(W_i)$  is the decision maker's utility from  $i$ th (1,2,3,.....) possible outcome and is expressed as;

$U(W_i) = \sqrt{W_i}$ , for a risk-averse individual,  $U(W_i) = 2W_i$ , for risk-neutral individual and

$U(W_i) = (W_i)^2$ , for risk-loving individual

$W_i$  is the outcome of the lottery;  $P_i$  is the probability of the outcome,  $i$  and  $E(U)$  is the expected utility of a lottery.

Assuming that, the farmer's objective is to maximize expected utility ( $E(U)$ ) from the crop output under the EUT; the farmer's decision on the amount of money to spend on inorganic fertilizer at non-random inorganic fertilizer prices, within variable weather is expected to depend on the farm, farmer characteristics which include farmer's risk preferences, socio-economic, and farm biophysical factors.


Most poor farmers are risk-averse and face high uncertainties in crop production as compared to wealthier farmers who are considered to have more assets and are thought to be risk-preferred. Wealthier farmers seem to be favoured not only by risk preferences but also by biophysical and socio-economic conditions. These conditions vary strongly between endowment groups; resource-endowed, intermediate, and resource-constrained (Masvaya, 2010). In addition, assets owned by farmers have been reported to increase their risk preferences and influence positively the adoption of new farm technologies.

Similarly, age and gender of the household head may contribute directly to a better understanding of risks. Likewise, household size and farm size are theorized to reduce risks and increase the likelihood of expenditures

Comment [WU15]: Not italics

on inorganic fertilizer. The higher the number of people in the household the more the manpower which in turn may increase farm production. In conjunction with this, high labor power in the household will reduce labor costs on the application of fertilizer; hence, enhancing expenses in inorganic fertilizer for high yield.

In the farm household context (Figure 1), we conceptualize that, in the riskier environment a household head farmer is expected to make sensible choices and the converse is true.



**Comment [WU16]:** Why it is image, I lose my confident on this conceptual framework. Is you directly taken from other body? Which one dependent variable?

**Figure 1: A conceptual framework**

**Source:** Modified from Herath and Wijekoon (2013)

## 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Study sites

This study involved the Southern and Northern highlands of Tanzania, represented by two regions Iringa and Arusha respectively (Figure 2). Regions were purposively chosen to represent variable ecologies the maize farming landscape. The studied regions involved 6 districts; Monduli, Karatu, Arumeru, Iringa rural, Kilolo and Mufindi. Special emphasis was in Karatu and Kilolo districts due to the inclusion of maize farmers from these districts in TAMASA fertilizer-specific trials and payoffs risk game.

In the year 2017, there was a variable rainfall distribution in the study sites, ranging from mean rainfall of 600mm – 2600mm in Kilolo district and 400mm – 1200mm in Karatu district (Figure 2). It was also reported by Hamisi (2013) and Pima *et al.*, (2021) that, regions from the Southern Highlands had reliable rainfall than those located in the Northern Highlands.




Figure 2: The schematic representation of the study area and rainfall patterns

## 2.2 Survey data

The study used cross-section data from an APS of the year 2017. This survey was conducted in 2016/2017 during the maize harvesting season, precisely from May 2017 to August 2017 by CIMMYT under the TAMASA (Taking Maize Agronomy to Scale in Africa) project. The survey used a stratified spatial sampling

frame to identify, and select areas covering maize-producing areas across an array of soil types and varied agro-ecologies as clearly explained by Andrade *et al.*, (2019) and Nord *et al.*, (2021).

Maize-growing regions and districts were purposively selected from highly maize-growing highlands (Southern and Northern highlands) within a spatial sampling frame, following the Africa Soil Information Service (AfSIS). Each district represents 1 grid (6 grids in total for two regions). These grids were then subdivided into 1×1 km cells/villages. There were three cells randomly selected per grid. In each 1×1 km cell, available maize farm households were identified, and 8 maize households were randomly selected for enumeration marking 144 household heads in the list. However, a total of 129 household heads (HHs) were available for the survey. Sampled household heads responded to the APS questionnaire which included household and maize focal plot. Soil fertility questions on maize plots were among the responded questions. The responses were recorded and used in the analysis.

**Comment [WU17]:** Why being it?

### 2.3 Elicitation of maize farmers' risk preferences

Data for risk preferences of maize farmers in selected regions were collected as in Mwaijande *et al.*, (2023), using the hypothetical question which was included in the APS questionnaire.

The question had four risk preference choices:

- (i) 50% chance of winning 40,000 Tshs and 50% of winning only 1,500Tshs
- (ii) 50% chance of winning 25,000 Tshs and 50% chance of winning 5000 Tshs
- (iii) 50% chance of winning 17,000 Tshs and 50% chance of winning 8000 Tshs, and
- (iv) 100% chance of winning 10,000 Tshs.

Household heads of the selected maize farmers responded to the question by choosing one of the options. Hence, they group themselves in the risk preference groups; risk averse and risk preferred groups basing on the utilities calculated from each option.

### 2.4 Data analysis

R statistical packages were used for data analysis. Data collected were checked using cumulative probabilities to reduce the influence of the large variance and skewness in some variables. The data with extreme values were sorted and the maximum value for the 99% was used for all extreme observations. Important explanatory variables used in the regression analysis were selected using standard regression procedures with the stepwise variable selection method. Initially, a univariate regression between Y and each separate explanatory variable X was done. Explanatory variables with a p-value less or equal to a significance level of 0.3, were allowed into the regression model whereas a variable with a significance level of 0.35 and above was not included in the model as in Kassile *et al.*, (2014). These levels of significance were subjectively chosen to overcome the problem of failing to identify vital explanatory variables in traditional levels (0.05).

**Comment [WU18]:** Describe it properly, What is that?

Risk preferences data were analyzed using utility and Pratt and Arrow's equations as in Mwaijande *et al.*, 2023. To investigate factors that are associated with an investment in inorganic fertilizer, Tobit model with a set of explanatory variables was applied in the R software version 3.6.3 using package VGAM. Thus, the relationship between observed inorganic fertilizer expenditures and explanatory variables was modelled as follows;

$$y_i^* = X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

where;  $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,  $y$  is a latent variable that is observed for values greater than  $\tau$  and censored otherwise. The observed  $y$  is defined by  $y_i = y_i^*$  if  $y_i^* > \tau$   $y_i = 0$  if  $y_i^* \leq \tau$ . In the typical tobit model, we assume that  $\tau = 0$  i.e. the data are censored at 0. Thus, we have  $y_i = y_i^*$  if  $y_i^* > 0$  and 0 if  $y_i^* \leq 0$

Whereas;

$Y =$  inorganic fertilizer expenditure (Tzs);

$X1 =$  risk preferences in classes/levels,

$X2 =$  asset values (Tzs),

$X3 =$  income from other sources (land, building rents, gardens, remittances, donations/gifts) (Tzs),

$X4 =$  income from livestock sales (Tzs),

$X5 =$  distance from crop market (km)

$X6 =$  distance to livestock market (km),

$X7 =$  age of the household head (years),

$X8 =$  gender (male, female)

$X9 =$  household size (numbers),

$X10 =$  children below 10 years (numbers),

$X11 =$  children 10 - 14 years (numbers),

$X12 =$  number of plots (numbers),

$X13 =$  regions (Arusha and Iringa regions)

$e =$  error term

### 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comment [WU19]:

#### 3.1 Descriptive statistics

Out of 129 interviewed household head farmers in Arusha and Iringa regions, 16% were females and 88% were males. The HHs had an average age of 49 years. The majority of the household heads had primary school education (72.87%) with very few secondary, college, and university graduates (Table 1). Households had a family size of 5 people on average, with more adults than children. This is often associated with labor availability for agricultural activities. Adults at production age could influence positively agricultural activities in terms of labor than children below 10 years.

These households have an average of 3 plots, with an average area of 1.07ha for maize plots. The average expenditure of HHs on inorganic fertilizer was 77,000Tzs in the main season (Table 1). Relating expenditures on inorganic fertilizers in the main season and acreage gave an insignificant difference among smallholder maize farmers ( $p = 0.081$ ). Thus, acreage size when other factors were constant, did not contribute to the expenditure on inorganic fertilizers in the studied area.

Comment [WU20]: Make it scientific unit

Moreover, maize farmers in the present study owned valuable assets. These include household, farm, and transport assets. Differences in types, amounts, and values of assets owned by household heads could substantiate their farming decisions. In addition, access to institutions and transaction thought to influence investment in inorganic fertilizer. However, studying maize farmers in Arusha and Iringa regions, inorganic fertilizer investment was neither influenced by the distance to the crop market, extension services, distance to fertilizer sell nor the distance to the livestock market.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of smallholder maize farmers in Iringa and Arusha regions**

| Variable   | Mean                  | SD        | Sample number (n) |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Age of household head (years)  | 49.57                 | (13.71)   | 129               |
| Household family size (n)  | 5.53                  | (2.55)    | 129               |
| Adult household members (n)  | 3.09                  | (1.56)    | 129               |
| Household members aged 10 -14 years (n)  | 1.18                  | (1.51)    | 129               |
| Household members aged below 10 years (n)  | 1.21                  | (1.23)    | 129               |
| Value of total assets (10,000s Tzs)  | 1024.27               | (2606.69) | 129               |
| Income from total livestock sales per year (10,000s Tzs)                                   | 463.69                | (4435.94) | 129               |
| Income from donations, gifts, remittances, land and building rentals per year (10000s Tzs) | 56.29                 | (336.50)  | 129               |
| Income from informal businesses/ activities per year (10000s Tzs)                          | 220.26                | (370.54)  | 36                |
| No. plots (n)  | 3.26                  | (1.53)    | 129               |
| Area of the maize focal plot (hectare)   | 1.07                  | (1.27)    | 129               |
| Expenditure on inorganic fertilizer in the main season (10,000s Tzs)                       | 7.70                  | (20.01)   | 129               |
| Distance from home to a market for farm produce (km)                                       | 9.43                  | (12.91)   | 129               |
| Distance from home to a market for livestock sales (km)                                    | 10.65                 | (13.16)   | 129               |
| Distance from home to extension services (km)  | 3.2                   | (6.4)     | 129               |
| Distance to fertilizer sale centre (km)  | 13.48                 | (14.68)   | 129               |
|  | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |           |                   |


|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| <b>Gender of the household head</b>                             | Female = 16.28, Male = 87.72 |
| <b>HH Non-schooling</b>   | 15.50                        |
| <b>HH attended Primary education</b>                            | 72.87                        |
| <b>HH attended ordinary secondary school level (Form 1 - 4)</b> | 9.30                         |
| <b>HH attended college and University education</b>             | 2.33                         |
| <b>Risk-preferred – maize farmers</b>                           | 58.73                        |
| <b>Risk-averse – maize farmers</b>                              | 41.27                        |

**Comment [WU21]:** Why you make bold and italics, also some variables were redundant like distance of agricultural sale, Now a time it better if you use education as continuous variable rather categorical

Expenditures were captured at the farm level, not from the plot-level data. The value of total assets was calculated using the number of assets owned in 2017 and the value for each asset. The value of total crop sales, and livestock sales were calculated using amount sold and price per unit. Income from business/informal activities was calculated using an estimate of monthly income. (1 dollar = 2200 Tzs in the year 2017).

The study comprised more risk-preferred smallholder maize farmers (58.73%) than risk-averse maize farmers (41.27) (Table 1). There was a difference of 17.46% between risk-preferred maize farmers and risk-averse maize farmers. The slight difference could result in mixed decisions on the amount of money spent on inorganic fertilizers. For the case of improved agricultural technologies, more than 50% of farmers in the study could adopt the technologies expected to have high outputs leaving behind 40% of maize farmers (risk-averse) who could follow slowly through observing attracting outputs from their fellow farmers.

Comparing Karatu and Kilolo districts (Figure 3), maize farmers in these districts were in similar risk preference groups. Nevertheless, when their risk preferences were related to inorganic fertilizer expenditure in a univariate regression model, risk-preferred maize farmers were observed to influence positively and significantly the expenditure on inorganic fertilizers at  $p < 0.05$  ( $p = 0.026$ ).




**Figure 3: The status of risk preferences in studied districts**

### 3.2 Soil fertility status of maize plots

Responding to the soil fertility question, maize farmers from Arusha were recorded to have ‘very fertile’ maize plots more than those in the Iringa region (Figure 4). The soil fertility findings in these regions which represent variable highlands features are similar to those of Ngailo *et al.*, (2016), Senkoro *et al.*, (2017).

Very fertile soils are soils that might lead to harvest even if there is no addition of inorganic fertilizer whilst ‘not fertile’ soils are those which result in zero harvests if required nutrients will not be added at required amounts and time. Growing maize in ‘not fertile’ soils requires the addition of nutrients especially Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Potassium at the right location, type, amount, and time to improve maize crop productivity. Hence, spending money for purchasing inorganic fertilizer is certain for the optimal yield of maize crop based on the soil type. Due to the heavy feeding capacity of maize crops than other food and cash crops (Holden, 2018), investment on inorganic fertilizers in maize plots is vital, especially for ‘not fertile’ soils. However, there are contradicting arguments on the outcomes of inorganic fertilizer investment in maize plots. It was reported by Marenja and Barrett, (2009), Suri, (2011), and Jama *et al.*, (2017), that contrary to farmers’ expectations of fertilizer investment, in some cases, minimal returns to fertilizer use were noted; low maize price ratio to high fertilizer price and negative response to fertilizers discourages fertilizer investment. In addition, location-specific factors as stipulated by Palmas and Chamberlin (2020) might influence agronomic and economic returns to fertilizer expenditures. Nevertheless, soil testing accompanied by site-specific nutrient management techniques on maize plots as addressed by Liverpool-Tassie *et al.*, (2019a) and Nord and Snapp, (2020) might reduce farmers’ uncertainties.


**Comment [WU22]:** Is this variable is the result of laboratory? Otherwise it is difficult judging by survey. In your report you didn't said anything about lab, but you draw some graph that one is not clear.



**Figure 4: The soil fertility status of the maize plots in the study regions for the season 2016/2017**


Two distinct responses were noted for maize household heads; those who were not using inorganic fertilizers and users of inorganic fertilizers. Most of the maize household heads (63.73%) did not apply inorganic

fertilizers on their maize plots. Specifically, maize farmers from Karatu district did not use inorganic fertilizer at all (Figure 5). Regrettably, zero or low usage of inorganic fertilizers might compound the existing problem of low maize yield if effective measures will not be executed. Besides, there is a strong correlation between maize yield, rainfall, nitrogen, and soil organic carbon (Palmas and Chamberlin, 2020). Availability of optimal rainfall amount and existing soil fertility status might influence the inorganic fertilizer use. The findings of low usage of inorganic fertilizers concur with Kihara *et al.*, (2016), Mukasa, 2018, Lobullu *et al.*, (2019).



**Figure 5: Use of inorganic fertilizer for the season 2016/2017**

The majority of maize farmers (44.23%), claimed that their soils were fertile enough to support maize production without a need for inorganic fertilizers (Figure 6). Some (27.89%) did not have enough cash to purchase fertilizers whilst 12.5% of maize farmers found inorganic fertilizers too expensive.



**Figure 6: Farmers' reasons for not using inorganic fertilizers in maize plots**

Few maize farmers (1.92%, and 0.96%) mentioned 'not profitable' and 'low response rate' as reasons for not using inorganic fertilizers, respectively. Largely, the findings of the present study agree with Mukasa (2018).

### 3.3 Modelling expenditures on inorganic fertilizers in maize farming


Table 2 presents the findings of modelling expenditures of inorganic fertilizers among maize farmers with variable socio-economic factors. The table showed that the expenditure on inorganic fertilizer for maize farmers in Iringa and Arusha regions were statistically explained by education status of household heads; no schooling ( $p=0.012$ ), primary education ( $p=0.005$ ), ordinary secondary education ( $p=0.031$ ), number of plots ( $p=0.01$ ), area of maize plot ( $p=2.7e-07$ ) and region factors ( $p=0.000$ ).

Non-schooling to secondary education levels variables related negatively then significantly to inorganic fertilizer expenditure. Maize farmers in these education levels did not spend their income on inorganic fertilizers. This might be due to low awareness on the importance of inorganic fertilizers, right type, rate of application and time of application. Xiaoling and Xianrong (2021) showed the positive contribution of highly educated farmers on fertilizer application and crop yield. Also, low income to suffice daily needs and purchase of inorganic fertilizers might be a reason. The initiatives should be in place to fasten crop production knowledge to farmers, especially on inorganic fertilizer use and expenditure. Training farmers could help them improve; soil health (Asenso-Okyere and Mekonnen, 2012), technical efficiency of inorganic fertilizers (Wang *et al.*, 2019) and boost crop production and yield (Huang *et al.*, 2012). The potential of training farmers on fertilizer management was also seen in Pan and Zhang (2018) in rice farming.

Correspondingly, having many plots was observed to increase the expenditure on inorganic fertilizers for maize smallholders (Table 2). More plots will allow farmers to rent some and generate income which will later be invested in purchasing inorganic fertilizers, similar to Chen *et al.*, (2009). According to Chen *et al.*, (2009), the large number of cropland areas influence positively the increase in technical efficiency of the farm and increase the farmer's flexibility to various modifications according to the household goals and needs. Moreover, the maize plot size related negatively to expenditure on inorganic fertilizers in this study. Maize farmers spent less on inorganic fertilizer for large plot sizes which might lead to insufficient nutrient uptake to the plants and later low crop yield.

Arusha regions displayed statistical significance but were negatively associated with expenditure on inorganic fertilizers. Maize farmers in this region particularly from Karatu district did not invest in inorganic fertilizers claiming of having highly fertile soils for crop production. Furthermore, regions and districts have different agro ecological features such as climate and soil structures which can be associated with expenditure on inorganic fertilizers. The variable amount of rainfall in selected districts (Figure 2), soil fertility variations (Figure 4) and inorganic fertilizer use in Karatu district (Figure 6) can explain the spotted low farmers' expenditure on inorganic fertilizer in Karatu district (Figure 7). It was further noted by Olwande *et al.*, (2009), that farmers in

drier areas have low fertilizer use than in high rainfall areas, thus farmers in drier areas tend to reduce weather, fertilizer failure risks and production loss through low investment on inorganic fertilizers. Similarly, when expenditure on inorganic fertilizers was regressed with districts, Kilolo district emerged a positive predictor on expenditure on inorganic fertilizers ( $p=0.004$ ) contrary to Karatu district ( $p=0.964$ ). Ideal rainfall amount is paramount to the absorption of nutrients from inorganic fertilizers to plants. Good absorption will lead to positive growth responses and high yield as compared to areas experiencing low or variable rainfall amount and low fertile soils (Rusinamhodzi *et al.*, 2011).



**Figure 7: The expenditure on in-organic fertilizers in the study area**

Risk-preferred maize farmers were positively related but not statistically significant when included in this model. This can also be explained by Figure 3 and Table 1, that the study was dominated by maize farmers in two risk preference groups with slightly similar composition. Thus, the influence of the risk preference variable might be overshadowed when more predictors were added to a model. However, the contribution of the risk-preferred maize farmers was seen when a univariate model was assumed between inorganic fertilizer expenditure and risk preferences ( $p=0.026$ ) and when Northern and Southern highlands were included in the model ( $p=0.007$ ) (Table 3). Coinciding with the theoretical framework (Figure 1), risk-preferred maize farmers were expected to be intermediate or resource-endowed farmers, who own several assets and/or have various sources of income to support farming activities. Thus, risk-preferred farmers might choose to put their money into buying inorganic fertilizers aiming at high maize yield at harvest and high profit at crop sale. Also, the resource accumulations of maize farmers who are risk-preferred Household Heads (HHs) could allow the input

expenditures to suffice farming requirements provided there is a higher outcome ahead. The study findings are in line with Bongole, (2021), who stated that risk-preferred farmers normally embrace costly outcomes.

Age of the household heads was statistically insignificant and negatively associated with the expenditure on inorganic fertilizers (Table 2). Thus, being aged is projected to reduce the amount of money spent on inorganic fertilizers. Age comes with a huge responsibility that requires variable investment to ascertain stable income. Hence, the aged maize farmers might direct their high income to economic activities with higher and fastest returns. However, Olwande *et al*, (2009) reported a positive contribution of age to the adoption of fertilizers in Kenya. Socioeconomic factors vary with locations and farm and farmers' characteristics, hence, mixed findings.

**Table 2: Tobit regression output explaining the expenditure on inorganic fertilizer in Iringa and Arusha regions**

| <i>Variable</i>  | <i>Coefficients</i>  | <i>P- values</i>       |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Intercept: 1</b>                                      | 3.64e <sup>05</sup>  | 0.256                  |
| <b>Intercept: 2</b>                                      | 1.27e <sup>01</sup>  | <2e <sup>-16</sup> *** |
| <b>Age of household head</b>                             | -7.75e <sup>02</sup> | 0.834                  |
| <b>Household size</b>                                    | 5.79e <sup>03</sup>  | 0.747                  |
| <b>Household heads – no schooling</b>                    | -6.91e <sup>05</sup> | 0.012*                 |
| <b>Primary education of household heads</b>              | -6.20e <sup>05</sup> | 0.005**                |
| <b>Ordinary secondary education of a household head</b>  | -5.39e <sup>05</sup> | 0.031*                 |
| <b>Risk preference of household head: risk preferred</b> | 5.17e <sup>04</sup>  | 0.606                  |
| <b>Assets of the household heads</b>                     | 2.33e <sup>-03</sup> | 0.105                  |
| <b>Income from other sources</b>                         | 1.65e <sup>-02</sup> | 0.121                  |
| <b>Number of plots</b>                                   | 9.44e <sup>04</sup>  | 0.001**                |
| <b>Area of maize plot</b>                                | -2.42e <sup>05</sup> | 2.7e-07***             |
| <b>Region: Arusha</b>                                    | -3.47e <sup>05</sup> | 0.000***               |

Names of linear predictors: mu, loglink (sd)Vr  
 Log-likelihood: -538.39 on 239 degrees of freedom  
 Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 18  
 No Hauck-Donner effect found in any of the estimates  
 Dependent variable: expenditure in inorganic fertilizer (Tzs)  
 Significance levels: \*\*\* 0.001 \*\* 0.01 \* 0.05

Economic factors were positively related to expenditure on inorganic fertilizer but not statistically significant (Table 2). This implies that the differences in mean income from maize farmers' economic activities in these two regions were not enough to influence the expenditure on inorganic fertilizers. Positive association indicates that engagement in economic activities among maize smallholder farmers is in line with expenditures on inorganic fertilizers. Economic activities stimulate acceptance and adoption of introduced agricultural technologies. Thus, injecting money into various economic activities acts as a risk absorbent for backing capital and investment of numerous activities. Consequently, smallholder maize farmers with several income-generating activities can spend the proposed amount of money on inorganic fertilizers to support crop productivity than those depending solely on agriculture production. The purchasing power is normally related positively to income sources the household head owns. The cash accumulated from livestock sales, crop sales,

remittances, renting buildings and lands as well as selling vegetables (Table 1), might be used to purchase inputs, such as; inorganic fertilizers, and hence boost agricultural productivity. These results concur with Duflo *et al.*, (2008) who reported low income as a reason for Kenyan rural farmers not purchasing inorganic fertilizers, Haji *et al.*, (2018), and Msinde *et al.*, (2020) explain the potential of other incomes for purchasing fertilizers in Tanzania. expenditures. Similarly, these findings relate to the reasons for not using inorganic fertilizers as narrated in Figure 6.

Comparing regression outputs from two regions (Table 2) and in both highlands (Table 3), risk-preferred maize farmers, asset values, and highlands were seen to predict expenditure on inorganic fertilizers when Southern and Northern highlands were enclosed in a model. This explains the contrasting behavior of maize farmers when locality is considered. There are factors that can be associated with location coverage in studying risks and fertilizer expenditure. Considering farmers in this distinctness, can play a great role in improving crop productivity.

**Table 3: Tobit regression output explaining the expenditure on inorganic fertilizer in both highlands**

| <i>Variable</i>  | <i>Coefficients</i>  | <i>P- values</i>       |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Intercept: 1</b>                                      | -2.45e <sup>05</sup> | 0.129                  |
| <b>Intercept: 2</b>                                      | 1.32e <sup>01</sup>  | <2e <sup>-16</sup> *** |
| <b>Age of household head</b>                             | 7.55e <sup>02</sup>  | 0.726                  |
| <b>Gender: Male</b>                                      | 5.56 e <sup>04</sup> | 0.506                  |
| <b>Household size</b>                                    | -2.84e <sup>04</sup> | 0.099                  |
| <b>Children aged 10 – 14 years</b>                       | 7.32e <sup>04</sup>  | 0.018*                 |
| <b>Risk preference of household head: risk preferred</b> | 1.53e <sup>05</sup>  | 0.007**                |
| <b>Asset values of the household heads</b>               | 4.07e <sup>-04</sup> | 0.002**                |
| <b>Income from other sources</b>                         | 2.28e <sup>-02</sup> | 0.000***               |
| <b>Number of plots</b>                                   | 4.22e <sup>04</sup>  | 0.005**                |
| <b>Highlands: Northern</b>                               | -5.92e <sup>05</sup> | < 2e-16***             |

**Comment [WU23]:** The difference between this table and Table 2 not clear, since this is a scientific paper please clarify.

Names of linear predictors: mu, loglink(sd)  
 Log-likelihood: -3677.864 on 1048 degrees of freedom  
 Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 6  
 No Hauck-Donner effect found in any of the estimates  
 Dependent variable: expenditure in inorganic fertilizer (Tzs)  
 Significance levels: '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05

#### 4 Conclusion

The study presented the importance of studying farmers' risk preferences and their influence on crop production through expenditures on inorganic fertilizers. Advocating and implementing policies like offering credits with affordable requirements and interests, inorganic fertilizer subsidies, and weather insurance programs; will improve farmers' capacity to cope with risks and hence prefer risky but productive decisions. These initiatives may also foster investment in inorganic fertilizers, specifically for risk-averse farmers who depend much on farming as their sole source of income and living. In addition, proper mechanisms should be in place to practically train maize farmers on maize production Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) especially on inorganic fertilizer use, importance of purchasing and applying inorganic fertilizers on their plots. Since, most of them seem to have insufficient maize production knowledge and fail to tap benefits attached with.

This study makes various contributions to the current writings on risk preferences and inorganic fertilizer investment. However, there is no clear evidence of the influence of the marginal return of inorganic fertilizers on fertilizer investment among maize smallholders in Tanzania. Soil testing and specific site nutrient management practices should be taken into account while advocating inorganic fertilizer use and the importance of purchasing these fertilizers.

The specificity of farmers' risk preferences, their farm, and farmers' characteristics as well as their agronomic and economic attributes, should be considered in crop improvement programs in order to improve crop production and farmers' livelihoods. The heterogeneity of soil, climate, and socioeconomic factors of maize farms and farmers should not be generalized in agro ecological highlands, instead, the uniqueness of their locations must be considered in inquiring input findings in specific regions and districts. This study is a foundation for regional and district risk studies to uncover the uniqueness of the maize smallholders' risk behavior in maize production.

**Comment [WU24]:** It seems like summary. Please try to write summary for you findings rather than summarizing.

## References

- Anandajayasekeram, P., Rukani, M., & Babu, S. (2007). *Impact of science on African agriculture and food security*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Andrade, J. F., Rattalino Edreira, J. I., Farrow, A., van Loon, M. P., Craufurd, P. Q., Rurinda, J., Zingore, S., Chamberlin, J., Claessens, L., Adewopo, J., van Ittersum, M. K., Cassman, K. G., & Grassini, P. (2019). A spatial framework for ex-ante impact assessment of agricultural technologies. *Global Food Security*, 20, 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.12.006>
- Arslan, R.C., Brümmer, M., Dohmen, T., Drewelies, J., Hertwig, R. and Wagner, G.G. (2020). How people know their risk preference. *Scientific reports*, 10(1), pp. 1-14
- Asenso-Okyere, K.; Mekonnen, D.A. The importance of ICTs in the provision of information for improving agricultural productivity and rural incomes in Africa. African Human Development Report. UNDP Sponsored Research Series. 2012. Available online: <http://120.52.51.14/www.undp.org/content/dam/rba/docs/Working%20Papers/ICT%20Productivity.pdf> (Accessed on 19 April 2023)
- Bernoulli, D. (1738). *Specimen Theoriae Novae de Mensura Sortis*. *Commentari Academiae Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitanae*, 5:175-192. Translated as: "Expositions of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk", *Econometrica*, 22:23-36 (1954). Reprinted in: Page, A.N. (1968), editor, *Utility Theory: A Book of Readings*, pages 199-214. John Wiley & Sons: New York etc.

**Comment [WU25]:** The reference were poorly written, use IOD for each author?

- Bezabih M, Sarr M. (2012). Risk preferences and environmental uncertainty: Implications for crop diversification decisions in Ethiopia. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 53(4), 483-505.
- Bongole, A.J. (2021). *Climate smart Agricultural practises and Food security: A case of Mbeya and Songwe regions in Tanzania* (Doctoral dissertation, Sokoine University of Agriculture).
- Briggs, W, (2016). *Uncertainty: the soul of modeling, probability & statistics*. Springer.
- Charness G., Gneezy U., Imas A. (2013). Experimental methods: Eliciting risk preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 87, 43-51. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.12.023>
- Chen, Z., Huffman, W. E., & Rozelle, S. (2009). Farm technology and technical efficiency: Evidence from four regions in China. *China economic review*, 20(2), 153-161.
- Cochrane, N., and D'Souza, A. (2015). *Measuring access to food in Tanzania: A food basket approach* (No. 1476-2016-121041).
- Cooper P.J.M, Dimes J, Rao K.P.C, Shapiro B, Shiferaw B, Twomlow S (2008). Coping better with current climatic variability in the rain-fed farming systems of sub-Saharan Africa: An essential first step in adapting to future climate change? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 126(1), 24-35. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2008.01.007>
- De Brauw, A. and Eozenou, P. (2014). Measuring risk attitudes among Mozambican farmers. *Journal of Development Economics*, 111, pp.61-74.
- Duflo E, Kremer M, Robinson J (2008). How high are rates of return to fertilizer? Evidence from field experiments in Kenya. *The American economic review*, 98(2), 482-488.
- Haji, A. K., Salehe, F. S., & Msinde, J. (2018). Adoption of rainfed paddy production technologies among smallholder farmers: a case of central District-Zanzibar, Tanzania. Cited June 2021, [suair.sua.ac.tz](http://suair.sua.ac.tz)
- Hamisi, J. (2013). *Study of rainfall trends and variability over Tanzania. A research project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the postgraduate Diploma in Meteorology*, University of Nairobi. 67 pp.
- Herath, C.S. and Wijekoon, R. (2013). Study on attitudes and perceptions of organic and non-organic coconut growers towards organic coconut farming. *Idesia*, 31(2), pp.5-14.
- Holden, S. T. (2018). Fertilizer and sustainable intensification in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Global food security*, 18, 20-26.

- Huang, J.; Xiang, C.; Jia, X.; Hu, R. (2012). Impacts of training on farmers' nitrogen use in maize production in Shandong, China. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 67, 321–327pp.
- Jama B, Kimani D, Harawa R, Mavuthu AK, Sileshi G.W (2017). Maize yield response, nitrogen use efficiency and financial returns to fertilizer on smallholder farms in southern Africa. *Food Security*, 9(3), 577-593.
- Kassile T, Lokina R, Mujinja P, Mmbando B.P (2014). Determinants of delay in care seeking among children under five with fever in Dodoma region, central Tanzania: a cross-sectional study. *Malaria Journal*, 13(1), 348. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-13-348
- Kemeze, F.H, Miranda, M.J., Kuwornu, J.K. and Anim-Somuah, H. (2020). Smallholder Farmer Risk Preferences in Northern Ghana: Evidence from a Controlled Field Experiment. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 56(10), pp.1894-1908, DOI: 10.1080/00220388.2020.1715
- Khan Z. R, Midega C. A. O, Pittchar J. O, Murage A. W, Birkett M. A, Bruce T. J. A, Pickett J. A (2014). Achieving food security for one million sub-Saharan African poor through push–pull innovation by 2020. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 369(1639).
- Kihara, J., Nziguheba, G., Zingore, S., Coulibaly, A., Esilaba, A., Kabambe, V., Njoroge, S., Palm, C. and Huisling, J., (2016). Understanding variability in crop response to fertilizer and amendments in sub-Saharan Africa. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 229, pp.1-12.
- Liverpool-Tassie, L. S. O, Omonona, B. T, Sanou, A, & Ogunleye, W. (2019). A profitability analysis of fertilizer use for maize production in Nigeria. *Gates Open Res*, 3(69), 69.
- Liverpool-Tassie, L. S. O, Omonona, B. T, Sanou, A, & Ogunleye, W. (2019). Fertilizer Use and Farmer Productivity in Nigeria: The Way Forward—A Reflection Piece. *Gates Open Res*, 3(763), 763.
- Lobulu, J, Shimelis, H, Laing, M, & Mushongi, A. A. (2019). Maize production constraints, traits preference and current Striga control options in western Tanzania: farmers' consultation and implications for breeding. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B—Soil & Plant Science*, 69(8), 734-746.
- Magrini E, Vigani M (2016). Technology adoption and the multiple dimensions of food security: the case of maize in Tanzania. *Food Security*, 8(4), 707-726.
- Marenya PP, Barrett CB (2009). State-conditional fertilizer yield response on western Kenyan farms. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 91(4), 991-1006.
- Masvaya, E. N., Nyamangara, J., Nyawasha, R. W., Zingore, S., Delve, R. J., & Giller, K. E. (2010). Effect of farmer management strategies on spatial variability of soil fertility and crop nutrient uptake in

contrasting agro-ecological zones in Zimbabwe. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 88(1), 111-120.

Morris ML (2007). *Fertilizer use in African agriculture: Lessons learned and good practice guidelines*: World Bank Publications.

Msinde, J. V., Urassa, J. K., & Nathan, I. (2020). Farm and off-farm linkages: The effect of off-farm employment on farm inputs and labour allocation in Kilombero valley, Tanzania. Cited February 2021, [suaire.sua.ac.tz](http://suaire.sua.ac.tz)

Mukasa A.N (2018). Technology adoption and risk exposure among smallholder farmers: Panel data evidence from Tanzania and Uganda. *World Development*, 105, 299-309.

Mbululo Y, Nyihirani F. (2012). Climate characteristics over southern highlands Tanzania. *Atmospheric and Climate Sciences*, 2(04), 454.

Mwajjande, V. J., Msinde, J. V., Akyoo, A. M., & Mushongi, A. A. (2023). Risk Preferences and Risk Perceptions among Smallholder Maize Farmers in Tanzania: Evidence from a Framed Field Experiment. *Theoretical Economics Letters*, 13, 397-418. <https://doi.org/10.4236/tel.2023.133027>.

Ngailo, J.A., Mwakasendo, J.A., Kisandu, D.B. and Tippe, D.E (2016). Rice farming in the southern highlands of Tanzania: management practices, socio-economic roles and production constraints. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 4(3).

Nord, A., and Snapp, S. (2020). Documentation of farmer perceptions and site- specific properties to improve soil management on smallholder farms in Tanzania. *Land Degradation & Development*, 31(15), 2074-2086.

Nord, A., Bekunda, M., McCormack, C. and Snapp, S., (2021). Barriers to sustainable intensification: overlooked disconnects between agricultural extension and farmer practice in maize-legume cropping systems in Tanzania. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, pp.1-19.

Olwande, J., Sikei, G., & Mathenge, M. (2009). Agricultural technology adoption: A panel analysis of smallholder farmers' fertilizer use in Kenya. Berkeley University, [escholarship.org](http://escholarship.org) (Cited on 17 April 2023)

Palmas, S., & Chamberlin, J. (2020). Fertilizer profitability for smallholder maize farmers in Tanzania: A spatially-explicit ex ante analysis. *PloS one*, 15(9), e0239149.

Pan, D., & Zhang, N. (2018). The role of agricultural training on fertilizer use knowledge: A randomized controlled experiment. *Ecological economics*, 148, 77-91.

- Pima, N. A., Mbungu, W. B., Balama, C. P., Maguzu, J., Siwa, E., & Sangiwa, M. J. (2021). Spatial and Temporal Variability in Hydro-Meteorological Selected Variable in the Southern Highlands, Tanzania. *Tanzania Journal of Forestry and Nature Conservation*, 90(3), 10-23.
- Rusinamhodzi, L., Corbeels, M., Van Wijk, M. T., Rufino, M. C., Nyamangara, J., & Giller, K. E. (2011). A meta-analysis of long-term effects of conservation agriculture on maize grain yield under rain-fed conditions. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, 31(4), 657-673.
- Sanou A. (2015). *Technology adoption when risk attitudes matter: Evidence from incentivized field experiments in Niger*: Michigan State University.
- Senkoro, C.J., Ley, G.J., Marandu, A.E., Wortmann, C., Mzimhiri, M., Msaky, J., Umbwe, R. and Lyimo, S.D. (2017). Optimizing fertilizer use within the context of integrated soil fertility management in Tanzania. *Fertilizer Use Optimization in sub-Saharan Africa*, 17, pp.176-192.
- Suleiman, R. A., & Kurt, R. A. (2015). Current maize production, postharvest losses and the risk of mycotoxins contamination in Tanzania. In *2015 ASABE Annual International Meeting* (p. 1). American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers.
- Suri T (2011). Selection and comparative advantage in technology adoption. *Econometrica*, 79(1), 159-209.
- URT (2018). 2016/17 Annual Agriculture Sample Survey crop and Livestock Report. Cited January, 05, 2020. [www.nbs.go.tz/takwimu/Agriculture/2016-17\\_AASSReport\\_Final...pdf](http://www.nbs.go.tz/takwimu/Agriculture/2016-17_AASSReport_Final...pdf)
- von Neumann, J. and Morgenstern, O. (1947). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2 edition.
- von Neumann J, Morgenstern O. (2007). *Theory of games and economic behavior (commemorative edition)*: Princeton university press.
- Wang, P., Zhang, W., Li, M., & Han, Y. (2019). Does fertilizer education program increase the technical efficiency of chemical fertilizer use? Evidence from wheat production in China. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 543.
- Xiaoling Li, Xianrong Wu (2021), The impact of social norms on rice farmers' behavior of organic fertilizers application: mediating effect of value perception and moderating effect of education level, *International Journal of Low-Carbon Technologies*, Volume 16, Issue 4, 1492–1503pp, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlct/ctab074>