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A B S T R A C T

The functional relationship between input factors namely independent variables like manures & fertilizers \((X_1)\), seed \((X_2)\), human labour \((X_3)\), irrigation charges \((X_4)\) and plant protection \((X_5)\) and dependent variable as okra production (yield) was estimated by Cobb-Douglas type production function. The co-efficient of multiple on all size group of farms was 0.92, 0.94 and 0.93 respectively, indicating that 92%, 94% and 93% of the variation in the yield is explained by independent factors like manures & fertilizers \((X_1)\), seed \((X_2)\), human labour \((X_3)\), irrigation charges \((X_4)\) and plant protection \((X_5)\). Returns to scale was less than 1 indicating that decreasing returns to scale. Only in case of medium farms, optimum level of human labour was used, reflects optimum allocation. Irrigation charges were used excessively in all size group of farms.
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Introduction

In the world, India is the second largest producer of vegetables with a production of 168.30 million tonnes from 9.5 million hectares of land area with productivity of 17.64 MT/ha during 2014-15 (HSD, DoA & co-operation). The production of vegetable in India is inadequate to meet the needs of the country (Gangwar and Chikara, 1973; Verma, 2007). The consumption of vegetables are about one-third of the dieticians-based recommended level. It is therefore, necessary to enhance the production of vegetables by way of expanding the acreage and stepping up the productivity of vegetables. In the vegetable kingdom, malvaceous vegetable crops are of pivotal importance. In the malvaceous vegetable group, the okra is considerably an important vegetable crop cultivated widely across seasons and space. Okra has a relatively good nutritional value and is a good complement. It is a good source of vitamin-A, B, C and it is also rich in protein, carbohydrates, fats, minerals, iron and iodine (Srivastava and Chand, 1977; Kumar et al., 2016). It is presently commercially grown in many countries viz India, Japan, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan etc. In India, total area of okra crops was 507 thousand ha production of 5853 MT and productivity 11.5 MT/ha in 2014-15 (HSD, DAC&FW). In U.P. area of okra crops grown was 14.18 thousand ha with annual production of 181.66 MT and productivity was 12.81 MT/ha in 2014-15 (HSD, DAC&FW). Seeing the economic and nutritional importance of okra, the present study entitled resource use efficiency of okra was undertaken.
**Materials and Methods**

The multistage stratified purposive random sampling method was applied to select block, villages and farmers. Out of 16 blocks in district Deoria, one block (Desahi Deoria) was selected purposively. A list of all the villages of this block was prepared along with their area and production under vegetables, only 5 villages viz Barawa meer chhapar, Desahi Deoria, Shampur, Pipara madan gopal and Shishwa were selected randomly for the investigation. A total of 100 okra growers (42 marginal, 38 small and 20 medium) were selected randomly from the universe of five selected villages on the proportion of farmers falling in each village under different size group of farms. These farmers were grouped according to size of holding they possess, that marginal (<1ha), small (1-2ha) and medium (2-4ha). The major vegetables were okra taken for the study and analysis on the basis of more area and production at different size group of farms. The enquiry was conducted by survey method. The data were collected by personal interview with selected vegetable growers on well prepared schedules. The period of inquiry pertained to the agricultural year 2015-16.

**Functional analysis**

To study the response of various independent variables on the output, various forms of production function have been dealt. However Cobb-Douglas production function was found most suitable and best fit to the data. Thus Cobb-Douglas production function was used for measuring resource use efficiency.

The mathematical form of Cobb-Douglas production functions are:

\[ Y = aX_1^{b_1}X_2^{b_2}X_3^{b_3}X_4^{b_4}X_5^{b_5} e^u \]

Where,

- \( Y \) = per hectare output (Rs./ha)
- \( X_1 \) = per hectare cost of manures and fertilizers (Rs./ha)
- \( X_2 \) = per hectare cost of seeds (Rs./ha)
- \( X_3 \) = per hectare cost of human labour days (Rs./ha)
- \( X_4 \) = per hectare cost of irrigation charges (Rs./ha)
- \( X_5 \) = per hectare cost of plant protection measures (Rs./ha)
- \( e^u \) = error term
- \( b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 \) and \( b_5 \) are production elasticities of the respective independent variables.

**M.V.P.** - The marginal value product of input was estimated by following formula.

\[ \text{MVP}_{X_j} = \frac{b_j \bar{Y}}{\bar{X}_j} \]

Where,

- \( \text{MVP}_{X_j} \) = Marginal value product of j input
- \( b_j \) = Production elasticity with respect to \( X_j \)
- \( \bar{Y} \) = Geometric mean of the dependent variable \( Y \)
- \( \bar{X}_j \) = Geometric mean of the independent variable \( X_j \)

After estimating the MVP, the resource use efficiency of different resources were judged with MVP = 1 Optimum use of resources

MVP < 1 Excess utilization of resources

MVP > 1 Underutilization of resources

**Results and Discussion**

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads:

**Distribution of sample okra cultivors**

The selected okra growers were grouped according to their size of total holding of
land. The cultivars were classified into three categories viz Marginal farmers (<1ha), Small farmers (1-2ha) and Medium (2-4ha). The distribution of sample farmers were given in table 1. The area under okra cultivation was 0.45ha in marginal, 1.46ha in small and 2.94ha in medium category with an overall average area under okra cultivation was 1.34ha.

**Input utilization**

Per hectare quantities of different input and their values are given in table 2. It was observed that family labour was maximum on marginal farms 12.88% followed by small farms 10.27% and medium farms 5.40% along with overall average 10.23%. Hired labour maximum was on medium farms 13.66% followed by small farms 8.49% and marginal farms 6.40% along with overall average.

Total overall expenditure incurred on seed was 7.64% which was maximum on medium farmers 8.88% followed by marginal 7.47% and medium 7.1%. Expenditure incurred by the marginal, small and medium farmers on manures & fertilizers was 10.79%, 11.46% and 12.73% respectively, with overall average 11.47%. This indicated that expenditure incurred on manures and fertilizers was highest on medium farmers followed by small and marginal farmers. Irrigation charges was maximum on small farmers 29.15% followed by medium 27.94% and marginal 26.12% with overall average 27.69%. Plant protection charges was also maximum on small farmers 1.88% followed by medium 1.79% and marginal 1.78% with overall average 1.82%.

**Resource use efficiency**

The Cobb-Douglas production function was used to study the resource use efficiency for different size group of farms. Elasticity of production, Returns to scale and Coefficient of multiple determination ($R^2$) for cultivation of okra on different size group of farms were worked and displayed in table 3.

It could be seen from the table that five input-factors, namely, manures & fertilizers, seed, human labour, irrigation charges and plant protection were considered as independent factors in fitting the Cobb-Douglas production function to the gross income data separately for marginal, small and medium farms. Significance of test to the factor elasticities of production was applied.

Table 1 Distribution of sample okra cultivars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Size group of farms</th>
<th>No. of sample farms</th>
<th>Net cultivated area (ha)</th>
<th>Average size of land holding (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Marginal (below - 1 ha)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.90 (14.16)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Small (1-2 ha)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.66 (41.70)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Medium (2-4 ha)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.90 (44.13)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Total overall average</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133.46 (100.00)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages to the total)
Table 2 Per hectare input used for okra cultivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Size group of sample farms</th>
<th>Overall average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal (in parentheses)</td>
<td>Small (in parentheses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Family Labour</td>
<td>9050.00 (12.88)</td>
<td>7800.00 (10.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hired Labour</td>
<td>4500.00 (6.40)</td>
<td>6450.00 (8.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Total Human Labour</td>
<td>13550.00 (19.28)</td>
<td>14250.00 (18.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tractor power</td>
<td>6647.00 (9.46)</td>
<td>6313.00 (8.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Seed cost</td>
<td>5250.00 (7.47)</td>
<td>5400.00 (7.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Manures &amp; fertilizers</td>
<td>7580.00 (10.79)</td>
<td>8700.00 (11.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Irrigation charges</td>
<td>18360.00 (26.12)</td>
<td>22131.00 (29.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Plant protection</td>
<td>1250.00 (1.78)</td>
<td>1430.00 (1.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages to the total)

Table 3 Resource use efficiency estimators of okra on different type group of farms in the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample farm</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
<th>Sum of elasticities</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal (below-1 ha)</td>
<td>0.1875* (0.0794)</td>
<td>0.4421** (0.0518)</td>
<td>0.0953 (0.0792)</td>
<td>0.0725 (0.0185)</td>
<td>0.0314 (0.0188)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-2ha)</td>
<td>0.1958* (0.0804)</td>
<td>0.3543** (0.0514)</td>
<td>0.1581 (0.0792)</td>
<td>0.0303 (0.0185)</td>
<td>0.0619 (0.0460)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2-4ha)</td>
<td>0.2668* (0.1040)</td>
<td>0.3930** (0.0778)</td>
<td>0.0690 (0.0792)</td>
<td>0.0806 (0.0185)</td>
<td>0.0203 (0.0289)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in parentheses reflect the standard error.
* and ** denote statistically significant at 5% and 1% probability level
Table 4 MVP of included factors in production of okra in the study areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample of farms</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal (below-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>16.025</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>4.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-2 ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.608</td>
<td>14.141</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>10.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2-4 ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.656</td>
<td>13.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>3.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistically significant variables were manures & fertilizers and seed for each size group of farms. In all case of farms manures and fertilizers were statistically significant at 5% probability level and seed was statistically significant at 1% probability level. And other variables were found non-significant on all size group of farms. Same results were observed by Godambe et al. (2015).

Returns to scale in all case of marginal, small and medium farms were found 0.82, 0.80 and 0.82, respectively which was less than one. It is therefore, interpreted that cultivation of okra crop is characterized by decreasing return to scale on each size group of farms. It is, therefore, inferred that increasing all the factors by 1 per cent simultaneously results in increase of the returns by less than 1 per cent on each crop situations.

In case of marginal, small and medium farms co-efficient of multiple determination was found to be 0.92, 0.94 and 0.93 respectively, indicating that 92%, 94% and 93% variation in the yield is explained by independent factors such as manures & fertilizers (X₁), seed (X₂), human labour (X₃), irrigation charges (X₄) and plant protection (X₅).

Marginal value productivity

MVP of included factors in production of okra in the study area is given in table 4. It could be seen from the table that in case of marginal, small and medium farms marginal value productivity of each included factors except irrigation charges and in case of medium farms except human labour in the fitted function was more than one, indicating further scope of investment on these factors to realize returns, more than the costs.

In case of medium farms, MVP value of human labour factor was found 1, reflects optimum allocation of this factor. In case of marginal, small and medium farms only MVP of irrigation charges was less than unity indicating excessive use of inputs resulting in additional returns less than the additional cost.
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