

Efficiency of Homestead Gardens Farmers in Eastern Cape Province, South Africa (Pathway to Food Security)

¹Fakunle Olufemi Oyedokun, ²Adio Matthew Olufemi, ²Fakayode Segun Bamidele and

³Ogunkunle Adenike Abisola

¹Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Fort Hare, South Africa

²Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Federal University, Oye-Ekiti, Ekiti, Nigeria

³Department of Agricultural Economics Ladoké Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Background and Objective: Household food security is a global concern of which South Africa is not left out. Despite government spending on food security projects most of the rural households in the Eastern Cape are not food secure. This paper sought to examine the socioeconomic characteristics and the Technical Efficiency of homestead food farmers in South Africa (Eastern Cape Province) with a view to knowing the relevance of homestead gardens and their contributions to the food security drive.

Materials and Methods: Two villages (Tyefu and Qamata) were purposively chosen and 60 households were randomly picked resulting in 120 homestead gardeners that were interviewed. Descriptive statistics, food security index and Stochastic Frontier Analysis were used to analyze the demographic features, food security and technical efficiency of these homestead gardeners, respectively. **Results:** It was discovered that 90% of these homestead gardens were not in use again, where they were in operations they were being operated by old women (Makhulu). As 92% of these farmers are of the age range 65-70 years. Maize, spinach, lettuce and other forms of vegetables were the dominant plants in these villages. As 68.14% of the respondents were food insecure while only 31.86% of them were food secure. The productivity of these gardeners is low but efficient in resource use. **Conclusion:** The importance of homestead food gardening in ensuring food security cannot be overlooked, hence, the call on the government to rebrand and promote homestead gardening as a pathway to the food security movement in the province.

KEYWORDS

Drive, efficiency, food security, food security index, homestead gardens, stochastic frontier analysis

Copyright © 2023 Oyedokun et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

There are many definitions of the word food security. It is the fundamentals of any community's health, The World Health Organization¹, "When people do not have adequate physical, social or economic access



to food” as stated above, it is considered, food insecurity². The World Food Summit came from a conference in 1996 and declared that a state of being food secure is when everyone has constant access to enough food that is safe, nutritious and sufficient for an active and healthy life. Food insecurity was divided into four categories by Sinyolo *et al.*³ in their study at national, regional, community and household levels. On the contrary, South Africa’s situation is a country that is food secured at the macroeconomic level whereas highly food insecure at the microeconomic level⁴. According to WHO¹, a nation can meet its population's food needs while maintaining the lowest per capita nutritional requirements when it does so.

In South Africa, part of the betterment planning and settlement policies adopted by the apartheid government is the homestead food gardens. This policy assisted the former homeland settlers to be self-dependent and food secure⁵. This pattern of farming has a number of distinguishing features that confirm its performance and the characteristics of those who earn their livelihood from farming⁶. Most of these farmers operate on very small land, they are known to use obsolete tools and their harvests are predominantly for subsistence⁷. Most of the early settlers in the Eastern Cape Province are called the Bantus, they are agro-pastorals in nature. They built their gardens around any available natural resources such as or mostly water. They engaged in livestock rearing and crop production mainly for home consumption. Most of the farming works were done collectively by the villagers, thereby reducing the farm input costs. To date, the farmers in the Eastern Cape Province are versatile in the natural way of reading the climatic conditions and other farming predictions and forecasts.

A community is said to be food-secured when the residents have access to sustainable, safe, adequate and culturally accepted nutritional standard food system which maximizes self-esteem in the community. The variables such as location, culture, health status availability of natural resources, income and the educational level of the dwellers in a community are often used in defining the food security state of a community³. Household food security occurs when there is access to adequate and quality food for all the members of the household⁴. The prevalent hunger and malnutrition in South Africa are not caused by the non-availability of food but rather by inadequate access to foodstuff by certain groups of people in rural communities. The most vulnerable group of people to food insecurity is women and children⁸. The production and supply of food are some of the variables used in the determination of food availability and expected utility. Income is also used in determining access to food and food utilization is measured by the nutritional level of the food, the health status of the people and the care given to these villagers⁹.

Homestead gardeners are the farmers who till the pieces of land around their houses or homes, they are predominantly subsistence in nature¹⁰. According to Muzangwa *et al.*¹¹, homestead gardeners have a lot of features that range from production objective which is basically for home consumption, the economic role of their production is supplementary, the tools of operation are purely simple, local and traditional in nature and the farming input costs are relatively cheap. They rely mostly on family labor and have limited access to financial assistance. They lack storage facilities for their perishable farm produce. Also getting farming input is a bit tough¹². Among the crops that are produced by the homestead gardeners are tomatoes, cabbage, lettuce, maize and sorghum. The cost of maintaining the homestead garden such as watering, application of fertilizer, disease and pest control is so simple which encouraged the settlers to grow vegetables and plants of high value¹³. Homestead gardens are more efficient and cost-effective to run than distance farms. Although homestead food gardeners use conservation methods of agriculture, outputs are very low but consistent more meaningful sources of food were recorded when it was fully in place in the former homelands¹⁴. Farmers should be encouraged to use their homestead farming experience and other available skills to produce more harvest¹⁵.

According to Slamet *et al.*¹⁵, household food security is achievable through the development of the agricultural sector. The designing of effective programs that will have positive impacts on improving the already existing agricultural practices is important¹⁶. This will help in increasing the productivity of the

smallholder farmers in the rural communities of South Africa and could serve as a driver of change in households and their nutritional status¹⁷ during this period, households are more food secure. There are lots of committed farmers who work in their gardens on a regular basis. Although the harvest was very small the resource use was efficient with the civilization, most of the young people were leaving the rural area to look for white-collar jobs thereby reducing the number of people participating in homestead food gardening. Therefore, this study examined the socioeconomic characteristics and the Technical Efficiency (TE) of homestead food farmers in South Africa (Eastern Cape Province, ECP).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in ECP of South Africa in the year 2017/2018 growing season. The province, one of South Africa's nine provinces, has shared borders with the Western Cape, the Free State, KwaZulu-Natal and Lesotho in the North¹⁸. In this region, there are 39 municipalities, 37 of which are local municipalities and two are metropolitan municipalities. The province is the homeland of the Xhosa people of South Africa. According to Statistics South Africa, the region is home to 6,562,053 of South Africa's 51,770,560 inhabitants. Statistics show that the rural population makes up approximately 60% of the total population¹⁹.

The demographic characteristics of ECP revealed a high prevalence of poverty, illiteracy and unemployment, as well as a dearth of basic commodities and inadequate infrastructure. There has been a continuous decline in the contribution of agriculture to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the area¹⁸⁻²⁰. Two stages (purposive and random) sampling techniques were used to select 120 respondents for this study which were drawn from four different locations namely, Tyefu and Qamata Villages in the Chris Hani District of Eastern Cape Province and administered questionnaire. Information about the state of the communities was successfully gathered as a result of meetings with stakeholders and community members. Following the conference, two villages, all located in the Chris Hani District, were chosen to serve as the research hub for this work. Data were gathered by a research team with the help of community authorities and cooperation from extension officers. A random selection technique was adopted. A total of 60 households were interviewed in each of these villages. In all, sample sizes of 120 smallholder households were interviewed for the study.

Analytical technique

Descriptive statistics: Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to describe the socio-economic features of the sampled households in the study area.

Food Security Index: Measuring food security of the homestead gardener Food Security Index (FSI) will be used. For this study, the Food Security Indicator (Index) used by Ohajianya *et al.*²¹ was utilized. The Food Security Index (FSI) calculates the average household food expenditure in monetary terms, including both cash and farm produce consumption. If a household spends at least two-thirds of the average food spending of the sampled households, it is said to be food secure, otherwise, it is said to be food insecure. As a result, the FSI is expressed as Ohajianya *et al.*²¹:

$$F_i = \frac{\text{Per capita food expenditure for the } i\text{th households}}{2/3 \text{ mean per capita food expenditure in all households}}$$

Where:

F_i = Food security index

When:

$F_i \geq 1$ = Food secure ith household

$F_i \leq 1$ = Food insecure ith household

Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA): The technical efficiency of homestead food gardeners was estimated using SFA. The results of this analysis were used to predict the resource use efficiency of these homestead food gardeners. The result was used to make investment recommendations for the most effective and sustainable gardens. Battese and Coelli²² and Ogundari and Ojoo²³ explained that an estimation of a specific company's technical efficiency was made using a Stochastic Production Frontier, which is defined as:

$$Y = f(X_i, \beta) + I$$

$$I = V - U$$

The stochastic frontier analysis provides an estimate of the technical efficiency levels. Following's²⁴ flexible log-linear Cobb-Douglas production function was employed in this study to calculate the stochastic frontier production function.

The stochastic frontier production function analysis: The Cobb-Douglas frontier production function is used in this study to define the stochastic frontier production function. The definition of the Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier model is²⁴:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \beta_3 \ln X_3 + \beta_4 \ln X_4 + \beta_5 \ln X_5 + V_i - U_i$$

Where:

- In = Natural Logarithm
- Y_i = Output from homestead garden (kg)
- X_1 = Seeds (kg)
- X_2 = Fertilizer (kg)
- X_3 = Pesticides (Liters)
- X_4 = Herbicides (Liters)
- X_5 = HCl (Liters)
- V_i = Error term (random)
- U_i = Error term (non-random or technical inefficiency effect)
- β_0 = Intercept
- $\beta_1 - \beta_5$ = Coefficients of regression

Inefficiency model is represented thus:

$$U_i = \delta_0 + \delta_1 S_1 + \delta_2 S_2 + \delta_3 S_3 + \delta_4 S_4 + \delta_5 S_5 + e_i$$

Where:

- U_i = Inefficiency effects of the ith farm
- S_1 = Sex
- S_2 = Marital status
- S_3 = Age in years
- S_4 = Years of education
- S_5 = Numbers of extension visit
- $\delta_1 - \delta_5$ = Estimated parameters
- e_i = Error term

Statistical analysis: Descriptive Statistics and Stochastic Frontier Analysis were used in this study and the results were taken at 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic characteristics of respondent: The result in Table 1 showed clearly that 90.0% of the respondents were females and 10.0% were males. It is an indication, that more females engage in homestead food gardening than the male counterparts and accounted for the reason for low productivity in the study areas. The result conforms with the study carried out by Adekunle¹⁶. In addition, 35.8% of the total responses are between the ages of 61 and 70, followed by 6.6% between the ages of 31 and 40, 21.6% between the ages of 41 and 50, 20.8% between the ages of 51 and 60, 14.4% between the ages of 71 and 80, 0.80% between the ages of 81 and 90. The implication of this distribution is that most of the people engaging in homestead food gardening are old people. That is why productivity is low. This result agreed with the study carried out by Meyer and Nishimwe-Niyimbanira²⁵ who asserted that as women get older they tend to participate in agriculture. Moreover, about 35.8% of households have between 3-6 members in the house, 48.3 of the households have between 7-10 people which is the largest proportion and 15.9% of the households have between 11-15 members. This result is in line with the study carried out by Musotsi *et al.*²⁶, that households with large numbers of people do participate in farming because they will have laborers to work on the farm. The distribution of the household by primary occupation showed that 75% of the household is majorly in farming, followed by 11.8%, the artisans and

Table 1: Socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 12 | 10.0 |
| Female | 108 | 90.0 |
| Age | | |
| 31-40 | 08 | 6.6 |
| 41-50 | 26 | 21.6 |
| 51-60 | 25 | 20.8 |
| 61-70 | 43 | 35.8 |
| 71-80 | 17 | 14.4 |
| 81-90 | 01 | 0.8 |
| Household size | | |
| 3-6 | 43 | 35.8 |
| 7-10 | 58 | 48.3 |
| 11-15 | 19 | 15.9 |
| Distribution of the household by pastoral | | |
| Sheep | 40 | 33.3 |
| Goat | 9 | 7.5 |
| Chicken | 55 | 45.8 |
| Cow | 9 | 7.5 |
| Not specified | 7 | 5.9 |
| Primary occupation | | |
| Family | 90 | 75.0 |
| Teaching | 8 | 6.6 |
| Civil servant | 4 | 3.3 |
| Artisans/apprentices | 14 | 11.8 |
| Not specified | 4 | 3.3 |
| Crop types | | |
| Cabbage | 61 | 50.8 |
| Lettuce | 5 | 4.2 |
| Carrot | 10 | 8.4 |
| Maize | 5 | 4.2 |
| Spinach | 20 | 16.8 |
| Butternut | 19 | 15.6 |
| Distribution of the households with the crop | | |
| Consumption | 80 | 66.7 |
| As gift | 30 | 25 |
| Sales | 10 | 8.3 |

Field survey, 2017

Table 2: Stochastic frontier (half-normal distributions)

| Variable | Parameters | Coefficient | SE | Z | p-value |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------|----------|
| Stochastic frontier | | | | | |
| Intercept_ | β_0 | 127.55 | 4362.11 | 0.03 | 0.980 |
| Seeds | β_1 | 29.89 | 3.96 | 7.55 | 0.000*** |
| Fertilizer | β_2 | 5.73 | 1.31 | 4.37 | 0.000*** |
| Pesticides | β_3 | -34.10 | 80.19 | -0.43 | 0.670 |
| Herbicides | β_4 | 81.77 | 37.15 | 2.20 | 0.030** |
| HCI | β_5 | 1106.06 | 200.83 | 5.51 | 0.000*** |
| Inefficiency model | | | | | |
| Sex | | 175.09 | 163.03 | 1.07 | 0.28 |
| Marital status | | 51.62 | 161.60 | 0.32 | 0.75 |
| Age | | -10.93 | 6.71 | -1.63 | 0.10 |
| Education | | 23.42 | 19.43 | 1.21 | 0.23 |
| Extension visit | | -1.86 | 3.79 | -0.49 | 0.62 |
| Variance parameter | | | | | |
| Sigma_v | | 637.0.1 | 43.34 | | |
| Sigma_u | | 0.08 | 5410.25 | | |
| Sigma2 | | 405784.9 | 55222.77 | | |
| Lambda | | 0.00 | 5410.66 | | |
| Log-likelihood | | -850.58 | | | |
| Wald chi2 | | 532.46 | | | |
| Mean technical efficiency | | 0.001 | | | |

** and *** represent 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance, SE: Standard error, Z: Z value and estimated standard error

6.6% engaging in teaching. As 3.3% did not signify their occupational status while the remaining 3.3% are civil servants. It showed that a larger percentage of the households sampled are majorly into farming. This result is in agreement with the study carried out by Mehrara and Mehrara²⁷ that a household's primary occupation is the one in which they spend at least 75% of their time and get the majority of their income. The result showed that 50.8% of the household plant cabbage, which is the plant with the highest percentage, Spinach is the next most planted vegetable with a distribution of 16.8% of the households and Butternut has 15.6% on the distribution chart, lettuce and maize have the same 4.2% and carrot is distributed at 8.4%. This result is in support of the outcome of the study carried out by Adekunle¹⁶. However, 66.7% of the households consumed their produce. As 25% agreed that sometimes they use it as gifts to their neighbor or visitors while 8.3% said they sell it to any intending buyer which is a very rare instance. This is in conformity with Muzangwa *et al.*¹¹, who said the sole aim of homestead gardens is purely for home consumption. Finally, about 45.8% of the households are into poultry keeping alongside the cultivation of land. As 33.3% had sheep in their homes and 7.5% of the households kept cows and goats. As 5.9% of the household did not specify the type of animal they keep and lastly. This confirmed the description of the Bantus in the Eastern Cape as an agro-pastoral group by Perry²⁰.

Food security: The results of the food security status revealed that 68.14% of the respondents were food insecure while only 31.86% of them were food secure.

Technical efficiency result of homestead food gardeners: The result of parameters obtained from the Stochastic Production Function is presented in Table 2. Due to the assumption that the data used in the model have a half-normal distribution, the coefficients (β 's) reported in this Table represent the elasticities of the various inputs utilized in household gardens²⁸. Seed, fertilizer, herbicides and HCI were all important and positive factors in the Table, indicating that their use was profitable. As a result, an increase in these inputs will eventually lead to an increase in farmers' yield. This result is in agreement with the findings of Akintayo and Rahji² that a unit increase in this input will eventually lead to a rise in the gardeners' output because the seed is a positive and significant component. In addition, the result also confirms the findings of Geta *et al.*²⁹ and Adio and Olaoye³⁰ where they found a strong and positive correlation between higher fertilizer application rates by farmers and higher production rates. This suggests that increasing the

amount of seed, fertilizer and pesticide used would considerably enhance yield for homestead gardeners. In terms of yield, pesticides showed a favorable link, but it was minor. This can mean that gardeners are using this variable less than they should be because it responds more to output. This result disagrees with the findings of Mehrara and Baghbanpour²⁷ which indicated a significant and positive impact of the usage of pesticides on maize production. With the average estimate of technical efficiency to be 100%, the predicted technical efficiencies in the study area vary greatly among the homestead food gardeners. This reveals that in this region farmers use their available production factors more effectively. Sex, marital status and age, which were socio-demographic factors that belonged to the inefficiency model, on the other hand, were all beneficial factors but inconsequential to the production of homestead gardeners.

This study clearly exposed the danger of neglecting the settlement plan and the dependence policy of the apartheid as enshrouded in the homestead food garden in the former homeland. Thus, for the food security agenda for all South Africans to be ensured since it is still an incubation period, this concept of homestead gardening plays a long way.

This study was only carried out in the Eastern Cape Province (ECP) of South Africa. The sample size can be expanded for further study.

CONCLUSION

The study discovered that the homestead food gardeners are very efficient in the use of the available few farming input resources at their disposal. This study exposed the danger of neglecting the settlement plan and the dependence policy of the apartheid as enshrouded in the homestead food garden in the former homeland leading to food insecurity. The study, therefore, recommends that there should be a guild in the high school to incorporate the teaching of homestead food gardening in the teaching curriculum.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

This study derived its purpose from the fact that household food security is achievable through the development of the agricultural sector and that the art of homestead food gardening has faded away. The result of the food security status revealed that 68.14% of the respondents were food insecure while only 31.86% of them were food secure and that seed, fertilizer, herbicides and HCl were all important and positive factors and their use was profitable and probably improving the food security status. As a result, the availability of these inputs will eventually lead to an increase in farmers' yield. The predicted technical efficiencies in the study area vary greatly among the homestead food gardeners.

REFERENCES

1. WHO, 2018. WHO Guideline on Health Policy and System Support to Optimize Community Health Worker Programmes. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, ISBN: 9789241550369, Pages: 112.
2. Akintayo, O.I. and M.A.Y. Rahji, 2016. Technical efficiency in rice ecologies of North Central Nigeria: Implications for national self-sufficiency. *Uganda J. Agric. Sci.*, 17: 99-110.
3. Sinyolo, S., M. Mudhara and E. Wale, 2014. The impact of smallholder irrigation on household welfare: The case of Tugela Ferry irrigation scheme in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Water SA*, 40: 145-156.
4. Akinyemi, B.E. and A. Mushunje, 2019. Land ownership and usage for agriculture: Empirical evidence from South African living conditions survey. *Cogent Social Sci.*, Vol. 5. 10.1080/23311886.2019.1663691.
5. Siphesihle, Q. and M. Lelethu, 2020. Factors affecting subsistence farming in rural areas of nyandeni local municipality in the Eastern Cape Province. *South Afr. J. Agric. Ext.*, 48: 92-105.

6. Ibeawuchi, I.I., N.A. Okoli, R.A. Alagba, M.O. Ofor, L.C. Emma-Okafor, C.A. Peter-Onoh and J.C. Obiefuna, 2015. Fruit and vegetable crop production in Nigeria: The gains, challenges and the way forward. *J. Biol. Agric. Healthcare*, 5: 194-208.
7. Fanadzo, M., C. Chiduzo and P.N.S. Mnkeni, 2010. Overview of smallholder irrigation schemes in South Africa: Relationship between farmer crop management practices and performance. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.*, 5: 3514-3523.
8. Djomo, J.M.N. and F. Sikod, 2012. The effects of human capital on agricultural productivity and farmer's income in Cameroon. *Int. Bus. Res.*, 5: 149-159.
9. Diecidue, E. and J. van de Ven, 2008. Aspiration level, probability of success and failure, and expected utility. *Int. Econ. Rev.*, 49: 683-700.
10. Agbugba, I.K., M. Christian and A. Obi, 2020. Economic analysis of smallholder maize farmers: Implications for public extension services in Eastern Cape. *South Afr. J. Agric. Ext.*, 48: 50-63.
11. Muzangwa, L., P.N.S. Mnkeni and C. Chiduzo, 2017. Assessment of conservation agriculture practices by smallholder farmers in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. *Agronomy*, Vol. 7. 10.3390/agronomy7030046.
12. Olufemi, F.O. and A. Obi, 2017. Determinants of commercialisation level among smallholder maize farmers in Eastern Cape, South Africa: A case study of qamata and tyefu municipality. *J. Hum. Ecol.*, 58: 118-125.
13. Kelechi, A.I. and T. Dorothy, 2015. Economic study of tropical leafy vegetables in South-East of Nigeria: The case of rural women farmers. *Am. J. Agric. Sci.*, 2: 34-41.
14. Beedell, J. and T. Rehman, 2000. Using social-psychology models to understand farmers' conservation behaviour. *J. Rural Stud.*, 16: 117-127.
15. Slamet, A., A. Nakayasu and M. Ichikawa, 2017. Small-scale vegetable farmers' participation in modern retail market channels in Indonesia: The determinants of and effects on their income. *Agriculture*, Vol. 7. 10.3390/agriculture7020011.
16. Adekunle, O., 2013. The role of home gardens in household food security in Eastern cape: A case study of three villages in Nkonkobe Municipality. *J. Agric. Sci.*, 5: 67-76.
17. Harper, S., N.B. King, S.C. Meersman, M.E. Reichman, N. Breen and J. Lynch, 2010. Implicit value judgments in the measurement of health inequalities. *Milbank Q.*, 88: 4-29.
18. Onyenekwe, S.C. and E.C. Okorji, 2015. Effects of off-farm work on the technical efficiency of rice farmers in Enugu State, Nigeria. *J. Agric. Econ. Dev.*, 4: 44-50.
19. Ogundari, K., T.T. Amos and V.O. Okoruwa, 2012. A review of Nigerian agricultural efficiency literature, 1999-2011: What does one learn from frontier studies? *Afr. Dev. Rev.*, 24: 93-106.
20. Perry, A.F., 2013. Ethnographic insights on rural sustainability; homestead design and permaculture of Eastern Cape settlements in South Africa. *Afr.: J. Dev. Stud.*, 43: 115-125.
21. Ohajianya, D.O., V.A. Enwerem, P.O. Offodile, S.U.O. Onyeagocha and M.N. Osuji *et al.*, 2011. Optimum farm plan for food security among smallholder farmers in Imo State, Nigeria. *Int. J. Agric. Sci. Res. Technol.*, 1: 133-136.
22. Battese, G.E. and T.J. Coelli, 1992. Frontier production functions, technical efficiency and panel data: With application to paddy farmers in India. *J. Prod. Anal.*, 3: 153-169.
23. Ogundari, K. and S.O. Ojo, 2005. The determinants of technical efficiency in mixed-crop food production in Nigeria: A stochastic parametric approach. *Eastern Africa J. Rural Dev.*, 21: 15-22.
24. Mazibuko, N.V.E and M.A. Antwi, 2019. Socio-economic factors influencing smallholder farmers agricultural infrastructure availability, accessibility and satisfaction: A case on North West Province in South Africa. *OIDA Int. J. Sustainable Dev.*, 12: 11-26.
25. Meyer, D.F. and R. Nishimwe-Niyimbanira, 2016. The impact of household size on poverty: An analysis of various low-income townships in the Northern Free State Region, South Africa. *Afr. Popul. Stud.*, 30: 2283-2295.
26. Musotsi, A.A., A.J. Sigot and M.O.A. Onyango, 2008. The role of home gardening in household food security in Butere division of Western Kenya. *Afr. J. Food Agric. Nutr. Dev.*, 8: 375-390.

27. Mehrara, M. and J. Baghbanpour, 2016. The contribution of industry and agriculture exports to economic growth: The case of developing countries. *World Sci. News*, 46: 100-111.
28. Battese, G.E., S.J. Malik and M.A. Gill, 1996. An investigation of technical inefficiencies of production of wheat farmers in four districts of Pakistan. *J. Agric. Econ.*, 47: 37-49.
29. Geta, E., A. Bogale, B. Kassa and E. Elias, 2013. Productivity and efficiency analysis of smallholder maize producers in Southern Ethiopia. *J. Hum. Ecol.*, 41: 67-75.
30. Adio, M.O. and A.T. Olaoye, 2022. Technical efficiency and profitability among maize based farmer in Kajola Local Government of Oyo State. *Int. J. Res. Innovation Social Sci.*, 6: 545-553.