

# **Original Research Article**

## **IMPACT OF CREDIT ON PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY: EVIDENCE FROM CASSAVA SMALLHOLDERS FARMERS IN SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA.**

### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** This study evaluates credit impact on production efficiency of cassava farmers in southwest Nigeria.

**Study design:** Cross-sectional study.

**Place and Duration of Study:** This study was conducted in South West Nigeria, between June 2019 and July 2021.

**Methodology:** Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 210 small holder cassava farmers for the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data on respondents' socio-economic characteristics, production efficiency and the efficiency distribution of cassava farmers.

**Results:** Results show 60.0% of the respondents were male, 81.0% were married, 70.5% have no contact with extension agents, 33.3% had secondary education, 61.9% saving and 49.5% access credit. Furthermore, mean age, farming experience and household size of the respondents were 43 years, 19 years and 6 persons respectively. Mean technical, allocative and economic efficiencies were 0.55, 0.91, and 0.50 respectively. Results of Stochastic production frontier show farm size ( $\gamma = 0.664$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), labour ( $\gamma = 0.183$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ) and quantity of stem cutting ( $\gamma = 0.160$ ,  $p \leq 0.05$ ) increased cassava output, while sex ( $\delta = 0.797$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), marital status ( $\delta = 0.600$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), level of education ( $\delta = 0.062$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ), number of extension contacts ( $\delta = 0.624$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and credit ( $\delta = 0.000004$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) significantly influenced efficiency among cassava farmers. Also, result of Maximum likelihood estimates of cost function shows rent on land ( $\omega = 0.455$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), price of fertilizer ( $\omega = 0.078$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and price of herbicide ( $\omega = 0.069$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) had positive influence on total cost incurred on cassava production while marital status ( $\delta = 0.600$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and credit ( $\delta = 0.000004$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) significantly influenced efficiency among cassava farmers.

**Conclusion:** The study concluded that credit had significant influence on cassava farmers' production efficiency. Hence, credits should be made available by relevant stakeholders to cassava farmers in the study area.

*Keywords:* [Credit, Production Efficiency, Cassava, Smallholder Farmers, Ogun State]

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Agriculture had been a very important sector among the various sectors that drive Nigeria economy (Samson and Obademi, 2018). According to Mgbakor *et al.* (2014), there is no meaningful development in a developing country that can take place without developing agricultural sector, most especially when it stands as the main stay of the nation's economy, and Nigeria is not an exception. Samson and Obademi (2018) also noted that almost one-third of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was accounted for by agricultural sector and employs about two third of the labour force directly and indirectly in Nigeria. Cassava, (*Manihot esculenta* crantz) in many tropical African countries is a crucial staple food, especially in Nigeria as it plays an essential role in the food economy of the country (Yuguda *et al.*, 2013). According to the released statistics in 2012 by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Nigeria is still claiming the top role over the past decades in world cassava production ahead of Thailand, Indonesia and other producing nations. It was also observed

that, per annum output by the country grow from 23.8 million tonnes in 1995 to 35.6 million tonnes in 2006. Also, Federal Department of Agricultural Extension (FDAE) in 2013, present the nation's output at 54.02 million tonnes, an increase of 6% more than the earlier year's figure of 50.96 million tonnes (Nwike *et al.*, 2017). However, despite all these, Eze and Nwibo (2014) asserted that, the country's full yields potential had not been acquired since small holder production scarcely exceeds 11 tonnes per hectare as contrary to 25 to 40 tonnes per hectare obtainable in other countries. For example, National yields achieved by Thailand in 2002 was 17.1 tonnes/ha, and the district yields in countries like Barbados and India was evaluated to be as large as 25 to 40 tonnes/ha. This revealed that Nigeria's largest productivity yields comes shorts of these rates and this circumstance was caused by a number of factors in which credit and inefficiency of cassava farming takes a greater percentage (Eze and Nwibo, 2014). This is evidence that required inputs such as investment capital, credit to acquire modern technologies for scaled-up production and other inputs are not in place or out of reach of cassava farmers, therefore accounting for high cost of production (Otunaiya, 2007). This becomes essential for Nigerian cassava farmers to raise investment capital that would be sufficient to meet the challenges through the use of agricultural credit. Filli *et al.* (2015) noted that credit is a catalyst with the capacity of driving production. This is an indication that credit is relevant to efficiency needed among small scale farmers and for the success of their farming. Furthermore, it was noted that the average productivity in Nigeria was 10.5 tonnes per hectare in the early 1970s, in early 1980s it was 11.5 tonnes per hectare and by late 1980s it was 10.5 metric tonnes per hectare and, in 1990s it was 11.5 tonnes per hectare (Eze and Nwibo, 2014). This pointing out a low production when contrast with 25 to 40 tonnes per hectare procured in other countries.

Moreover, before the period of oil boom, agriculture was the mainstay of the nation's economy but lack of adequate infrastructural facilities and the neglect of the rural sectors which comprises of small farmers had caused tremendous fall in the agricultural productivity as well as efficiency of cassava production (Samson and Obademi, 2018). According to Iyanda *et al.* (2014), the cassava yearly output statistic given by zone for 1999-2002 revealed that, North Central produce averagely 7,255,510 tonnes of cassava (the geopolitical zone with the highest production of cassava), while North West produce averagely 2,390,251 tonnes and North East, averagely 149,166 tonnes of cassava. In the Southern region, South East cassava production is averagely 5,590,951 tonnes, South West also produce averagely 5,513,600 tonnes, while South South produce averagely 6,374,577 tonnes. In South West Nigeria, Ogun State is the leading producer of cassava followed by Ondo State and Oyo state respectively (Iyanda *et al.*, 2014). In spite of this, there is still a need to improve production efficiency of cassava farming among small holders in the study area to attract more farmers into cassava farming. For example, the real output of cassava extends between 8 and 15 tonnes per hectare, compared to an attainable output of 30 tonnes per hectare (FAO, 2011 as cited in IITA, 2015). Also, according to Okoh, (2016), the prospects for enhanced cassava production is becoming high, given the increasing interest of more buyers in buying cassava products within and outside Nigeria putting pressure on the need to improve the production efficiency of cassava farming among small holders. Samson and Obademi (2018) communicate cases of credit insufficiency among rural farmers in Nigeria while Awotide *et al.* (2015) and, Ibrahim and Yusuf, (2017), also pointed that in rural areas of developing countries, credit constraints have significant unfavourable effects on farm yield. Consequently, Productivity and efficiency are adversely affected. Nandi *et al.* (2011). pointed that Nigerians are indigent and hungry despite efforts made by various governments in elevating agricultural productivity and efficiency of the rural farmers who are the crucial stakeholders of agricultural production. Nigeria's Cassava production has more prospective than what it is currently. It was noted that cassava farmers obtained yields which are lower than the expected potential. Farmers are still under producing due to a poor rate of production efficiency (Bamidele *et al.*, 2008), prompting a reason to ascertain and estimate the production efficiency of cassava farmers and how it will be impacted by credit to improve the efficiency and increase the productivity of cassava farming. In view of the above, there is a need to improve production efficiency by looking on how credit impact efficiency of cassava farmers. Thus, the focal point of this study was to assess the production efficiency (technical, allocative and economic efficiencies) and to examine the factors that influence production efficiency, including credit among smallholders cassava farmers in the study area. The results of this study will be of great benefit to the farmers and other stakeholders in the agricultural industry, as it help featured those variables that could be better managed to improve the efficiency of cassava farming.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### The study area

This study was conducted in South West Nigeria. It lies between latitudes 5° and 9° North and longitudes 2° and 8° east of the Greenwich meridian. It is bounded in the South by the Atlantic Ocean, in the north by Kogi and Kwara States, in the south by Edo State and in the west by republic of Benin. It has a land area of about 114,270 square kilometers equating about 12 percent of the country total farmable land.

The area has a tropical climate of dry and rainy seasons as the two major seasons. The rainy season occurs between March/April to October/November each year, while the dry season begins in October/November and last till March/April. Although in recent times, minor changes were noticeable in rainfall regimes due to global climate change. The average daily temperature ranges between 25°C (77.0 °F) and 35°C (95.0 °F), while the annual rainfall ranges between 150mm and 3000mm. Agriculture is the basis of the economy contributing the crucial single occupation for the people especially those in the rural areas. Arable crops like maize, rice, groundnut, kola-nuts, cassava, yam, cocoyam, oranges and sugar-cane are produced in the area. Southwest is one of the major producers of cassava in the country, and kolanut in the country (IITA, 2004). The natural resource endowment of the area includes land, water, mineral, forest and agricultural resources, through which a wide range of agricultural and forest products, are obtained. Mineral resources include limestone, chalk, phosphates, silica sand, gypsum, and clay (Southwest Investment Exhibition and Summit, 2016).

### Data collection and sampling technique

Primary data was used for this study. Data on socio-economic characteristics and production efficiency were obtained through a questionnaire that was administered to the cassava farmers in the study areas.

Multi-stage sampling procedure was used for this study, the first stage was a purposive selection of three states in the southwest region base on cassava production, processing and marketing activities in the states (IITA, 2004). The second stage involved purposive selection of a major cassava producing zone from each state. The third stage was purposive selection of the highest cassava producing block from each selected zones. At the fourth stage, the highest cassava producing cell was purposively selected from the sampled blocks. In the fifth stage, 96 farmers were randomly sampled from each of the selected cells adopting Israel (1992) sample selection formulae as follows:

$$n_o = \frac{Z^2pq}{e^2} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

where:

$n_o$  = sample size,

$Z^2$  = abscissa of the normal curve,

$e$  = precision level,

$p$  = estimated proportion of character present in the population (i.e. smallholder cassava farming),

$q = 1 - p$ .

$$\therefore n_o = \frac{(1.96)^2(0.5)(0.5)}{(0.1)^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow n_o = 96.04 \approx 96$$

**Table 1: Sampling procedure**

| Stages | Selection       | Procedure                  | Size        | Selection Method   | Criteria         |
|--------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1      | Southwest State | Ondo, Ogun and Oyo         | 3 states    | Purposive Sampling | Highest producer |
| 2      | ADP Zone        | 1 zone x selected state    | 3 zones     | Purposive Sampling | Highest producer |
| 3      | ADP blocks      | 1 block x selected zone    | 3 blocks    | Purposive Sampling | Highest producer |
| 4      | ADP cells       | 1 cell x selected block    | 3 cells     | Purposive Sampling | Highest producer |
| 5      | 96 farmers      | 96 farmers x selected cell | 288 farmers | Random Sampling    | Small holders    |

---

Total

288 farmers

---

However, 59 farmers declined participation while the remaining 229 consented. Albeit, 210 out of 229 responses were found useful for data analysis given a response rate of 91.7%.

### **Analytical techniques**

The tools of analysis used to achieve the objectives of this study were descriptive statistics and stochastic frontier analysis.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics was used to describe socio-economic characteristics of the respondent such as age, gender, farming experience, household size, marital status, educational status and credit. It was also used to describe the efficiency distribution of the respondents.

### **Stochastic Production Frontier and Production Efficiency Estimates**

Stochastic production frontier was used to estimate the production efficiency and the factors affecting production efficiency, including credit. Following Wassie (2014), the model was specified as:

$$Q_i = f(Z_i, \alpha) + (V_i - U_i) \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

Where:

$Q_i$  is the output (kg) of the  $i$ th farm

$Z_i$  is a vector of input quantities of the  $i$ th farm

$\alpha$  is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated

$\Omega_i$  = composite error term

$$\Omega_i = v_i - u_i \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

$v_i$  = Decomposed error term measuring technical efficiency of the  $i$ th farm.,

$u_i$  = The inefficiency component of the error term.

$U_i$  are non-negative variables, called technical inefficiency effects which are assumed to be half normally distributed  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ .

A Cobb-Douglas production form of the frontier that was used for this study was specified as:

$$\ln Q = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln Z_1 + \alpha_2 \ln Z_2 + \alpha_3 \ln Z_3 + \alpha_4 \ln Z_4 + \alpha_5 \ln Z_5 + V_i - U_i \dots\dots\dots(4)$$

Where;

$\ln$  = Natural logarithm (i.e. logarithm to base  $e$ )

$Q_i$  = Output of farmer (kg)

$Z_1$  = Farm size (ha)

$Z_2$  = Labour (labour-days)

$Z_3$  = Fertilizer (kg)

$Z_4$  = Herbicide (litres)

$Z_5$  = Stem cuttings (kg)

The inefficiency model was represented by  $U_i$  which was defined as;

$$U_i = \delta_0 + \delta_1 X_1 + \delta_2 X_2 + \delta_3 X_3 + \delta_4 X_4 + \delta_5 X_5 + \delta_6 X_6 + \delta_7 X_7 + \dots + \delta_9 X_9 + \varepsilon_0 \dots\dots\dots(5)$$

Where:

$U_i$  = Technical inefficiency

$X_1$  = Age (years)

$X_2$  = Sex (1 if male, 0 otherwise)

$X_3$  = Marital status (1 if married, 0 otherwise)

$X_4$  = Farming experience (years)  
 $X_5$  = Education level (years of formal schooling)  
 $X_6$  = Extension contact (number of extension visits)  
 $X_7$  = Household size (numbers of persons)  
 $X_8$  = Credit  
 $X_9$  = Saving (Yes = 1, No = 0)  
 $\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_9$  are the parameters to be estimated

The Cobb-Douglas cost frontier function is specified as;

$$\ln C_i = \omega_0 + \omega_1 \ln P_{1i} + \omega_2 \ln P_{2i} + \omega_3 \ln P_{3i} + \omega_4 \ln P_{4i} + \omega_5 \ln P_{5i} + V_i + u_i \dots \dots (13)$$

Where:

$C_i$  = total input cost of the  $i$ th farms (₦)  
 $P_{1i}$  = rent on land per hectare (₦)  
 $P_{2i}$  = wage rate of labour per labour day (₦)  
 $P_{3i}$  = average price of fertilizer per Kg (₦)  
 $P_{4i}$  = average price of herbicides per litre (₦)  
 $P_{5i}$  = price of stem cuttings per Kg (₦)  
 $V_i$  = Random variability in the production that cannot be influenced by the farmer  
 $u_i$  = deviation from maximum potential output attributed to technical inefficiency

Where:

$U_i$  = Technical inefficiency  
 $X_1$  = Age (years)  
 $X_2$  = Sex (1 if male, 0 otherwise)  
 $X_3$  = Marital status (1 if married, 0 otherwise)  
 $X_4$  = Farming experience (years)  
 $X_5$  = Education level (years of formal schooling)  
 $X_6$  = Extension contact (number of extension visits)  
 $X_7$  = Household size (numbers of persons)  
 $X_8$  = Credit  
 $X_9$  = Saving (Yes = 1, No = 0)  
 $\omega_1 - \omega_5$  = parameters to be estimated.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

The result revealed that 30% of cassava farmers were within 31- 40 years as shown in Table 2. The agility and productivity of a farmer is highly dependent on his/her age. It is a general believe that the older a farmer becomes, the less productive such an individual is likely to be, which will invariably affects the income-generating ability of that individual. The mean age of the cassava farmers was 42years which is almost the same value reported by Okoh (2016) who got 46 years as the mean age of cassava farmers, the result indication is that most of the cassava farmers are still in a period of their productive age, that is they are still young, vibrant and dynamic and this may have a beneficial influence on their productivity, income as well as credit availability. This confirm the argument of Akerele (2016), who said that age influence the level of physical work and the willingness to take risk.

The result revealed that, 60% of the cassava farmers were male and 40% were female. The implication of this result is that male dominated cassava farming and the dominance of male over female in the enterprise may be because cassava farming is tedious and requires a lot of energy which female might not be able to provide. The gender of the farmer determines the level of income that comes to the farmer, this is in alignment with the result given by Oladejo, (2016); Okoh, (2016); Shadrack Owusu, (2017).

The result revealed that majority (81%) of the cassava farmers were married, 12.9%, 3.8%, 0.5% and 1.9% of the cassava farmers were single, widowed, divorced and separated respectively. Marital status prompts commitment to business because of the family needs that must be met and this will invariably enhance productivity. The implication of this result is that majority of

the cassava farmers were fully-grown enough, capable and responsible to cater for their households as well as have a clear knowledge of their wellbeing. This also support previous findings as revealed by *Iyanda et al.*, (2014); *Donald et al.*, (2016). The result revealed that most (33.3%) of the cassava farmers had secondary education, while 17.6%, 32.9% and 16.2% had no formal education, had primary and tertiary education respectively. The adoption capacity of a farmer about a technology requires that the farmer is well exposed and educated, the implication of this result is that most of the cassava farmers were educated and this will have a positive influence on their ability to adopt innovative practices in cassava production which will invariably increase their efficiency and income (Eze and Nwibo, 2014). This also affirm with the finding of *Okoh* (2016), that said education is needed to enhance productivity among farming households and that a high literacy level will enhance productivity. The result revealed that majority (50.7%) of the cassava farmers had between 6-10persons in their households. Household size and its determinants are important factors to consider in describing households' pursuit for economic activities and the welfare of the households, household size affects the availability of labour for farming activities (Eze and Nwibo, 2014). The mean size of the household is approximately 6persons which also is visually the same with the result given by *Donald et al*, (2016). The implication of the result is that the households had a fairly large household size they can employ their household labours on their farms when they are free (*Donald et al*, 2016).

The result revealed that most (34.4%) of the cassava farmers had between 11-20years farming experience, the mean farming experience was 20years. Farmer's number of years spent in farming gives an clue of the practical knowledge he/she has acquired on how to deal in production, when experience is properly channeled it can lead to higher efficiency, higher productivity, higher income and can translate to improve standard of living (*Okoh*, 2016), the implication of this result is that most of the cassava farmers in the three states are well experienced about problem facing them in cassava production, this may have a positive influence on their efficiency and income generated (*Akerele*, 2016).

The result revealed that, 70.5% of the cassava farmers had no extension contact while 29.5% had extension contact. The result revealed that most (61.9%) of the cassava farmer were involve in savings while (38.1%) were not involved in savings respectively.

The result revealed that 4s9.5% of the cassava farmer had access to credit while the remaining 50.5% did not have access to credit as shown in Table 2. The implication of this result is that there is likelihood that some farmers are more productive than their counterparts as a result of their access to credit facilities as credit may likely increase their scale of production (*Iyanda et al.*, 2014; *Awotide et al.*, 2015; *Shadrack Owusu*, 2017).

**Table 2: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents**

| <b>Socio-economic characteristics of respondents</b> |                  |                   |
|--|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Variable</b>                                      | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
| <b>Age</b>   |                  |                   |
| ≤30years   | 44               | 21                |
| 31-40years   | 63               | 30                |
| 41-50years   | 44               | 21                |
| 51-60years   | 31               | 14                |
| ≥61years   | 28               | 13                |
| Mean   | <b>42.71</b>     |                   |
| Std.Deviation  | <b>16.47</b>     |                   |
| <b>Sex</b>   |                  |                   |
| Female   | 84               | 40                |
| Male   | 126              | 60                |
| Total  | <b>210</b>       | <b>100</b>        |
| <b>Marital status</b>                                |                  |                   |
| Single   | 27               | 12.9              |
| Married  | 170              | 81                |
| Divorced   | 1                | 0.5               |
| Widowed  | 8                | 3.8               |
| Separated  | 4                | 1.9               |
| Total  | <b>210</b>       | <b>100</b>        |
| <b>Educational level</b>                             |                  |                   |

|                          |              |            |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Non-formal               | 37           | 17.6       |
| Primary                  | 69           | 32.9       |
| Secondary                | 70           | 33.3       |
| Tertiary                 | 34           | 16.2       |
| Others                   | 0            | 0          |
| Total                    | <b>210</b>   | <b>100</b> |
| <b>Household size</b>    |              |            |
| 1-5persons               | 98           | 46.9       |
| 6-10persons              | 106          | 50.7       |
| 11-15persons             | 5            | 1.9        |
| 16-20persons             | 1            | 0.5        |
| Mean                     | <b>5.81</b>  |            |
| Std.Deviation            | <b>2.44</b>  |            |
| <b>Experience</b>        |              |            |
| 1-10years                | 66           | 31.6       |
| 11-20years               | 72           | 34.4       |
| 21-30years               | 40           | 19.1       |
| 31-40years               | 21           | 10.0       |
| >40years                 | 11           | 4.9        |
| Mean                     | <b>19.49</b> |            |
| Std.Deviation            | <b>12.60</b> |            |
| <b>Extension contact</b> |              |            |
| No                       | 148          | 70.5       |
| Yes                      | 62           | 29.5       |
| Total                    | 210          | 100.0      |
| <b>Saving</b>            |              |            |
| No                       | 80           | 38.1       |
| Yes                      | 130          | 61.9       |
| Total                    | 210          | 100.0      |
| <b>Access to credit</b>  |              |            |
| Non-access               | 106          | 50.50      |
| Access                   | 104          | 49.50      |
| Total                    | 210          | 100.00     |

\*Source: Field Survey, 2019.

### Maximum likelihood estimates of the production function of cassava farmers

The result of the Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) of the parameters of the Cobb Douglas Stochastic Frontier Production Function (SFPF) and inefficiency model of cassava farmers is presented on Table 3. The variance parameters, sigma-square ( $\delta^2$ ) and gamma ( $\gamma$ ) were estimated at 0.32 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and 0.575 ( $p < 0.01$ ), respectively. The sigma-square attests to the goodness of fit and correctness of the distributional form assumed for the composite error term while the gamma indicates the systematic influences that are unexplained by the production function and the dominant sources of random errors. This implies that about 57.5% of the variation in output of cassava farmers is due to the differences in their technical inefficiency. The parameter estimates of the production function of

cassava farmers revealed that farm size ( $\alpha = 0.664$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), labour ( $\alpha = 0.183$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and quantity of stem ( $\alpha = 0.160$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) increase the output of cassava. The coefficient of farm size revealed that if the size of farm used for cultivating cassava increases by 1%, the output of cassava will increase by 0.664, the coefficient of labour implies that if the number of labour employed increases by 1%, the output of cassava will increase by 0.183, the coefficient of quantity of stem revealed that if the quantity of cassava stem increases by 1%, output of cassava will increase by 0.160. This result is similar to that of Oduntan *et al.*, (2012) and Nwike *et al.*, (2017) who also reported that cassava input such as farm size, labour and material inputs were significant factors influencing the output of cassava.

Factors affecting inefficiency of the cassava farmers, the contribution of farmer's personal characteristics; age, sex, household size, marital status, farming experience, level of education, off-farm income, numbers of extension contact and credit were examined. The sign of the coefficients of these variables has important policy implications as positive sign implies negative effect on efficiency while negative sign signifies a positive effect on efficiency. Result revealed that male farmers were more technically efficient than their female counterparts, this maybe because most of the cassava farmers were male, this result agrees with that of Donald *et al.*, (2016). Also, married farmers were more technically efficient compared to their counterparts. Result further revealed that the higher the level of education, the higher the technical efficiency of the farmers ( $\delta = 0.062$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This is so because education exposes the farmers to new innovative practices in cassava production thereby increasing their technical efficiency, this agrees with that of Oduntan *et al.*, (2012). Furthermore, the higher the number of

contacts with extension agents, the higher the technical efficiency of the cassava farmers ( $\delta = 0.624$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This is so because access to extension agents exposes farmers to innovative practices which will invariably increase their technical efficiency, this supports the findings of Ambali *et al.*, (2012). Result also revealed that the higher the credit, the higher the technical efficiency of the cassava farmers. This is so because credit allows farmers to try new innovative practices and allow them to cultivate large expanse of land thereby resulting to higher technical efficiency, this support the results of Oduntan, (2012) and Nwike *et al.*, (2017).

**Table 3: Maximum likelihood estimates of cobb-douglas stochastic production frontier for cassava farmers**

| Variable                     | Coefficient | Standard Error | T-value | P-value |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|---------|
| Constant                     | 1.887***    | 0.217          | 8.69    | 0.000   |
| Farm size                    | 0.664***    | 0.085          | 7.79    | 0.000   |
| Labour                       | 0.183***    | 0.039          | 4.67    | 0.000   |
| Fertilizer                   | -0.048      | 0.108          | -0.44   | 0.657   |
| Herbicide                    | -0.011      | 0.047          | -0.24   | 0.810   |
| Stem                         | 0.160**     | 0.075          | 2.13    | 0.033   |
| <b>Inefficiency Model</b>    |             |                |         |         |
| Constant                     | 0.150       | 0.450          | 0.33    | 0.738   |
| Age                          | 0.014       | 0.012          | 1.21    | 0.226   |
| Sex                          | -0.797***   | 0.241          | -3.30   | 0.001   |
| Household size               | 0.073       | 0.060          | 1.21    | 0.226   |
| Marital status               | -0.600**    | 0.294          | -2.04   | 0.041   |
| Farming experience           | -0.012      | 0.011          | -1.07   | 0.284   |
| Education level              | -0.062***   | 0.016          | -3.80   | 0.000   |
| Saving                       | -3.63e-06   | 5.08e-06       | -0.71   | 0.476   |
| Extension contact            | -0.624**    | 0.245          | -2.56   | 0.020   |
| Credit                       | -3.96e-06** | 1.22e-06       | -2.21   | 0.023   |
| <b>Diagnostic statistics</b> |             |                |         |         |
| Sigma square                 | 0.320***    | 0.047          |         |         |
| Gamma                        | 0.575***    | 0.018          |         |         |
| Log-Likelihood               | -236.121    |                |         |         |

\*Source: Field Survey, 2019. \*\*\* Significant at 1% \*\* Significant at 5% \*Significant at 10%

### Maximum likelihood estimates of the cost function of cassava farmers

The result of the Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) of the parameters of the Cobb Douglas Stochastic Frontier Cost Function (SFCF) and inefficiency model of cassava farmers is presented on Table 4. The variance parameters, sigma-square ( $\delta^2$ ) and gamma ( $\gamma$ ) were estimated at 0.826 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and 0.995 ( $p < 0.01$ ), respectively. The sigma-square attests to the goodness of fit and correctness of the distributional form assumed for the composite error term while the gamma indicates the systematic influences that are unexplained by the production function and the dominant sources of random errors. This implies that about 99.5% of the variation in total cost of cassava farmers is due to the differences in their cost inefficiency. The parameter estimates of the cost function of cassava farmers revealed that rent on land ( $\omega = 0.455$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), price of fertilizer ( $\omega = 0.078$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and price of herbicide ( $\omega = 0.069$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) had positive influence on the total cost incurred on cassava production. The coefficient of rent on land revealed that if the rent on farmland increases by 1%, the total cost incurred will increase by 0.455, the coefficient of price of fertilizer implies that if the price of fertilizer

increases by 1%, the total cost incurred will increase by 0.078, the coefficient of price of herbicide revealed that if the price of herbicide increases by 1%, the total cost incurred will increase by 0.069 (Siewe, 2015).

Factors affecting inefficiency of the cassava farmers, the contribution of farmer's personal characteristics; age, sex, household size, marital status, farming experience, level of education, off-farm income, numbers of extension contact and credit are examined. The sign of the coefficients of these variables has important policy implications as positive sign implies negative effect on efficiency while negative sign signifies a positive effect on efficiency. The coefficient of marital revealed that married household heads are more cost efficient than their counterparts ( $\delta = 3.42$ ,  $p < 0.10$ ), this is so because married individuals are more likely to have a large family members which assist them on their farm land thereby reducing the cost on labour and this will invariably increase their cost efficiency. The coefficient of credit revealed that the higher the credit, the higher the cost efficiency of the cassava farmers ( $\delta = 0.23$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), that is increase in credit increases the cost efficiency of the cassava farmers.

**Table 4: Maximum likelihood estimates of cobb-douglas stochastic cost frontier for cassava farmers**

| Variable                  | Coefficient  | Standard Error | T-value | P-value |  |
|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|---------|--|
| Constant                  | 6.756***     | 1.963          | 3.44    | 0.001   | *Source: Field Survey, 2019. *** Significant at 1% ** Significant at 5% *Significant at 10%  |
| Rent on land              | 0.455***     | 0.043          | 10.65   | 0.000   |  |
| Labour wage               | 0.097        | 0.060          | 1.61    | 0.108   |  |
| Price of fertilizer       | 0.078***     | 0.019          | 4.12    | 0.000   |  |
| Price of herbicide        | 0.069***     | 0.018          | 3.86    | 0.000   |  |
| Price of stem             | -0.150       | 0.301          | -0.50   | 0.620   |  |
| <b>Inefficiency Model</b> |              |                |         |         | <b>Technical efficiency of cassava farmers' in southwest Nigeria</b><br>The result as shown in Table 5 revealed that 15.7% of the cassava farmers had technical efficiency less than 0.20, 6.7% had technical efficiency between 0.201-0.40, 26.7% had technical efficiency between 0.401-0.600, most (39.0%) had technical efficiency between 0.601-0.800 while 11.9% had technical |
| Constant                  | -4.827       | 3.055          | -1.58   | 0.114   |  |
| Age                       | -0.014       | 0.049          | -0.28   | 0.783   |  |
| Sex                       | -0.077       | 1.279          | -0.06   | 0.952   |  |
| Household size            | 0.265        | 0.296          | 0.89    | 0.371   |  |
| Marital status            | -3.424*      | 1.873          | -1.83   | 0.067   |  |
| Farming experience        | 0.077        | 0.067          | 1.15    | 0.249   |  |
| Education level           | 0.065        | 0.079          | 0.83    | 0.408   |  |
| Saving                    | 0.101e-04    | 0.253e-04      | 0.40    | 0.688   |  |
| Extension contact         | 2.254        | 1.504          | 1.50    | 0.134   |  |
| Credit                    | -0.235e-04** | 0.108e-04      | -2.18   | 0.028   |  |
| Diagnostic statistics     |              |                |         |         |  |
| Sigma square              | 0.826***     | 0.041          |         |         |  |
| Gamma                     | 0.995***     | 0.023          |         |         |  |
| Log-Likelihood            | -260.341     |                |         |         |  |

efficiency greater than 0.801, the mean technical efficiency of the cassava farmers is 0.55, this implies that the cassava farmers were able to obtain 55.0% of their output from their input mix or combination, this implies that there is room for 45.0% improvement in technical efficiency. This finding conforms to Eze and Nwibo, (2014) who reported existence of technical efficiency gap in cassava production.

#### Allocative efficiency of cassava farmers in southwest Nigeria

The result as shown in Table 5 revealed that majority (98.1%) of the cassava farmers had allocative efficiency greater than 0.801 and 1.4% had allocative efficiency between 0.601-0.800 while 0.5% had allocative efficiency between 0.401-0.600, the mean allocative efficiency of the cassava farmers is 0.91 which implies that the cassava farmers were able to minimize 91.0% of their total production cost, this shows that there is room for 9.0% improvement in allocative efficiency.

#### Economic efficiency of cassava farmers in southwest Nigeria

The result as shown in Table 5 revealed that 16.7% of the cassava farmers had economic efficiency less than 0.20, 8.1% had economic efficiency between 0.201-0.400, 30.5% had economic efficiency between 0.401-0.600 and most (41.9%) had allocative efficiency between 0.601-0.800 while 2.9% had economic efficiency greater than 0.801, the mean economic efficiency of the cassava farmers is 0.50 which implies that the cassava farmers were able to obtain 50.0% of their output at the lowest cost possible, this shows that there is room for 50.0% improvement in economic efficiency. This finding agrees with that of Nwike *et al.*,(2017) who reported existence of efficiency gap in cassava production.

**Table 5: Efficiency Distribution of Cassava Farmers in Southwest**

| Efficiency Distribution of Cassava Farmers |           |            |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Class                                      | Frequency | Percentage |
| <b>Technical Efficiency</b>                |           |            |
| ≤0.200                                     | 33        | 15.70      |
| 0.201-0.400                                | 14        | 6.70       |
| 0.401-0.600                                | 56        | 26.70      |
| 0.601-0.800                                | 82        | 39.00      |
| ≥0.801                                     | 25        | 11.90      |
| <b>Mean</b>                                | 0.55      |            |
| <b>Minimum</b>                             | 0.02      |            |
| <b>Maximum</b>                             | 0.89      |            |
| <b>Allocative Efficiency</b>               |           |            |
| ≤0.200                                     | 0         | 0.00       |
| 0.201-0.400                                | 0         | 0.00       |
| 0.401-0.600                                | 1         | 0.50       |
| 0.601-0.800                                | 3         | 1.40       |
| ≥0.801                                     | 206       | 98.10      |
| <b>Mean</b>                                | 0.91      |            |
| <b>Minimum</b>                             | 0.59      |            |
| <b>Maximum</b>                             | 0.97      |            |
| <b>Economic Efficiency</b>                 |           |            |
| ≤0.200                                     | 35        | 16.70      |
| 0.201-0.400                                | 17        | 8.10       |
| 0.401-0.600                                | 64        | 30.50      |
| 0.601-0.800                                | 88        | 41.90      |
| ≥0.801                                     | 6         | 2.90       |
| <b>Mean</b>                                | 0.50      |            |
| <b>Minimum</b>                             | 0.02      |            |
| <b>Maximum</b>                             | 0.84      |            |

\*Source: Field Survey, 2019.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study was carried out to assess the production efficiency (technical, allocative and economic efficiencies) and to examine the factors that influence production efficiency, including credit among smallholder's cassava farmers in the study area. The study concluded that cassava production is a productive enterprise in Southwest and that credit had significant influence on production efficiency.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made to improve efficiency of cassava production in the study area; 1) Credit should be made available to the cassava farmers by stakeholders to increase the production efficiency of the cassava farmers do you know the recovery %. 2) Emphasis should be put on encouraging the participation of younger why.....18-60-year age group is fit..... isn't it? and agile people in Agriculture especially in cassava farming. 3) Extension services what type and how? should be provided by government authorities, as this will help farmer to improve their production efficiency. 4) Farmers should be encouraged to go for adult education training ?-since the level of education increases their production efficiencies.

#### CONSENT (WHERE EVER APPLICABLE)

Not applicable

#### ETHICAL APPROVAL (WHERE EVER APPLICABLE)

Not applicable

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Akerele, E. O. (2016). Effects of Cooperative Credit on Cassava Production in Yewa Division, Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 23: 2422-8397.
- [2] Ambali, O. I., Adegbite D. A., Ayinde, I. A. and Awotide, D. O. (2012). Analysis of Production Efficiency of Food Crop Farmers in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science* 7(9): 1990-6145.
- [3] Awotide, B. A., Abdoulaye, T., Alene, A. and Manyong, V. M. (2015). Impact of Access to Credit on Agricultural Productivity: Evidence from Smallholder Cassava Farmers in Nigeria. A contributed paper prepared for oral presentation at the International Conference of Agricultural Economists (ICAE) Milan, Italy August 9-14, 2015.
- [4] Bamidele, F. S., Babatunde, R. O. and Rasheed, A. (2008). Productivity Analysis of Cassava-based Production Systems in the Guinea Savannah: Case study of Kwara State, Nigeria. *American-Eurasian Journal of Scientific Research* 3(1): 33-39.
- [5] Donald, D. D., Josephine, B. A., Joseph, A., Peter, I. A., Lateef, S., Michael, N., *et al.* (2016). Technical Efficiency Among Small and Medium Scale Entrepreneurs in High Quality Cassava Flour in Four Geo-political Zones of Nigeria. *European Journal of Physical and Agricultural Sciences* 4(3): 2056-5879.
- [6] Eze, A. V. and Nwibo, S. U. (2014). Economic and technical efficiency of cassava production in Ika North East Local Government area of Delta State, Nigeria. *Academic journals* 6(10): 429-436. ISSN: 2006-9774.
- [7] International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) (2004). Preemptive Management of the Virulent Cassava Mosaic Disease through an Integrated Cassava Development Approach for Enhanced Rural Sector Economy in the South-south and South-east zones of Nigeria, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria, (79). (*In press*).

- [8] International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA) (2015). Scientists and Development Partners Spot Agronomy as a Cure for Cassava Production Issues in Africa: *Research to nourish Africa*. IITA headquarters, Ibadan, Oyo State, (5). Accessed 29 August 2019.  
Available: <http://www.iita.org/news-item/scientists-development-partners-spot-agronomy-cure-cassava-production-issues-africa/>
- [9] Israel, Glenn D. (1992). *Sampling the Evidence of Extension Program Impact*. Program Evaluation and Organizational Development, IFAS, University of Florida. PEOD-5. October.
- [10] Iyanda, J. O., Afolami, C. A., Obayelu, A. E., Ladebo, O. J. (2014). Social Capital and Access to Credit among Cassava Farming Households in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences* 3(2): 175-196. ISSN: 2334-2404
- [11] Mgbakor M. N., Uzendu P. O. and Ndubisi D. O. (2014). Sources of Agricultural Credit to Small-Scale Farmers in Ezeagu Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS)* 7(8): 01-08. ISSN: 2319-2380.
- [12] Nandi, J. A., Gunn, P. and Yurkushi, E. N. (2011). Economic Analysis of Cassava Production in Obubra Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(3): 205-209.
- [13] Nwike, M. C., Okoli, T. O., Oghenehogagame, P. and Ugwumba C. O. A. (2017). Economic Efficiency and Returns to Scale of Cassava Production in Southeast Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture Innovations and Research*, (6): 108-113. ISSN (Online) 2319-1473
- [14] Oduntan, O., Amos, T.T. and Oseni, J.O. (2012). Efficiency and Profitability of Small-Scale Cassava Production in Akure Area of Ondo State, Nigeria. A publication of the School of Agriculture Technology, The Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria. Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics. (*In press*).
- [15] Okoh, M. A. (2016). Analysis of profitability and resource use efficiency in cassava farming in benue state of Nigeria. A dissertation submitted to the school of postgraduate studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. M.Sc. /AGRIC / 2701 / 2009-10. Department of Agricultural economics and rural sociology, Faculty of Agriculture Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria, 2016. (*In press*).
- [16] Oladejo, J. A. (2016). Profitability Analysis Of Cassava Tuber Marketing In Oyo State, Nigeria: Implication For Sustainable Development Goals. *Science Agricultural* 16(2): 67-73. ISSN: 2311-0228.
- [17] Samson, A., and Obademi, O. (2018). The determinants and impact of access to agricultural credit on productivity by farmers in Nigeria; Evidence from Oyo State, Nigeria. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal* 5(3): 252-265.
- [18] Shadrack Owusu, (2017). Effect of Access to Credit on Agricultural Productivity: Evidence from Cassava Farmers in the Afigya-Kwabre District of Ghana. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Social Sciences & Strategic Management Techniques* 4(2): 55-67. ISSN: 2467-8155
- [19] Southwest Investment Exhibition and Summit, (2016). <http://Southwestinvest.com/ondo-state/>
- [20] Wassie, S. B. (2014). Efficiency of Agricultural Production: Technical Efficiency of Major crops In Ethiopia: Stochastic Frontier Model. Department of economics Universitetet i Oslo. (*In press*). <http://www.duo.uio.no/>
- [21] Yuguda, R. M., Girei, A. A., Dire, B., and Salihu, M., (2013). Social-Economic Factors and Constraints Influencing Productivity among Cassava Farmers in Taraba State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science in Technology*, 1(1): 1-15. ISSN: 2348-1358.

UNDER PEER REVIEW