

1 A Study on Resource use Efficiency of Agricultural Input Factors
2 with Reference to Farm Size in Three Revenue Mandals of
3 Nellore District: Andhra Pradesh

4 Dr. E. Lokanadha Reddy¹ and Dr. D. Radhakrishna Reddy²

5 ¹ SRI VENKATESWARA COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
6 (AUTONOMOUS)

7 *Received: 14 December 2013 Accepted: 4 January 2014 Published: 15 January 2014*

8

9 **Abstract**

10 Farm-size is of an extreme interest in agriculture. This has been much debated over what may
11 be appropriate size of the farm because the size of the operating unit, as in the case of
12 manufacturing industries, decisively affects the income from agriculture. Since the amount of
13 income is dependent on the size of the farm, preponderance in small and tiny holdings is
14 mainly responsible poor peasantry in the third world countries. Even where there is no cost
15 advantage or disadvantage for farms of various sizes, small farms will have, under usual price
16 relationship, lower incomes and savings than large farms. Thus, size of farms is a vital element
17 in determining the earning capacity of the farmer as well as the efficiency of a farming unit.
18 Hence the present study aims to analyse the resource use efficiency of input factors in different
19 size-level farms based on entire sample of Farms in three revenue mandals of Nellore District,
20 Andhra Pradesh. Data was collected for the variables with the help of survey method through
21 personal interviews of the farmers selected through mixed sampling. By studying the Marginal
22 Value Products of factors of production, we assessed the relative importance of factors of
23 production.

24

25 **Index terms**— Keywords: resourceuse, efficiency, marginal value product, marginal cost, regression co-
26 efficient, geometric mean.

27 **1 Introduction**

28 arm-size is of an extreme interest in agriculture. This has been much debated over what may be appropriate size
29 of the farm because the size of the operating unit, as in the case of manufacturing industries, decisively affects
30 the income from agriculture. In case of manufacturing industry, we have optimum size of the unit, a size which
31 is in existing conditions of technique and organizing ability has the lowest average cost of production per unit.
32 Similarly in agriculture, too, we have a size, which under given conditions, would yield the best results to the
33 farmer. The advantages of large and small farms have been debated for atleast a century.

34 There are economists and farmers who advocate large-scale farming for efficient operations, a satisfactory
35 income to the farm family and food to the consumer at reasonable rate. But, on the other hand, some persons
36 strongly advocate small-scale farming on the ground of social justice. Poverty in agriculture, in most of the third
37 world countries is as much a problem of farm size as of other single factor. The great majority of farm families
38 in these developing countries with low income line on undersized and adequate units. Even where there is no
39 cost advantage or disadvantage for farms of various sizes, small farms will have, under usual price relationship,
40 lower incomes and savings than large farms. Thus, size of farms is a vital element in determining the earning
41 capacity of the farmer as well as the efficiency of a farming unit. The size of the farm is usually measured on the

4 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

42 basis of acreage. This is the only measure consistently used by the agricultural census of many countries of the
43 world. India is a land of small units of cultivation. A predominantly large proportion of the cultivated holdings
44 has steadily continued. Today about 82 percent of the holdings are being operated in small units covering about
45 39 percent of the total operated land. It is obvious at a glance that small units of cultivation reflect a serious
46 imbalance on the land-man ratio. In contrast to large holdings which suffer from lack of labour and inputs,
47 the small units suffer from holdings also have less of motivation than the other farmers. The new approach in
48 agricultural production serves to emphasize the importance of small units of cultivation and to understand the
49 problems connected with these.

50 Many evaluative studies were made an impact on new technology in transforming Indian Agriculture. The
51 extreme diversities in resource endowments and relative factor scarcities have led the economists to make a diverse
52 assessment about the impact of the new technology on the small and large farms. The northern states which
53 are endowed with a developed in frastructural and irrigational facilities, surpass the other states in sharing the
54 benefits.

2 F

56 There are number of studies on the agricultural sector in Nellore district. Among these studies, the research
57 on agricultural production is very limited. The empirical investigations are needed to study the resource use
58 efficiency of input factors in different sizelevel farms. Hence, the empirical and scientific investigational study of
59 resource use efficiency of input factors in the rural economy of Nellore district is an important phenomena. In
60 the present study, an attempt has been made to study the resource use efficiency of input factors in different
61 size-level farms basing on entire sample of farms of three mandals, namely, Kaligiri, Muttukur and Pellakur of
62 Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh.

3 II.

4 Review of Literature

64 Rajvir Singh and Patel¹⁸ [1973] made an attempt to examine the relationship between output and farm-size
65 in Meerut district of Utter Pradesh. The authors was concluded that in the context of new technology there is
66 no indication of decrease in output per hectare with an increase in farm-size and, therefore, the hypothesis of
67 inverse relationship is rejected in the area under study. One possible explanation for these trends is that, as farm
68 technology undergoes a change; large farmers take together interest in using land more intensively with modern
69 inputs at proper time in the week of higher probability offered by the New Technology.

70 Based on the data derived from different resources, Hanumantha Rao⁸ [1965] reached the following
71 observations, "Despite better access to resources, output per acre among large farms under the traditional labour
72 intensive technology was cost of (hired) labour was higher for them for small family farms. Also, managerial
73 and supervisory diseconomies of large-size under labour-intensive methods accounted for lower labour input
74 per acre among large farms. Technological changes created new production possibilities for large farms which
75 could now increasingly substitute capital for labour by adopting biological as well as mechanical techniques and
76 produce at a faster rate than small farms. The latest evidence shows that the inverse relationship between
77 farm size and output per acre found under traditional technology no longer holds true with the adoption of
78 new technology". Hatia and Datta³ [1987] made an attempt to analyse, whether the use of different energy
79 inputs help in promoting employment. The study was conducted in the Amritsar District for the year 1984-85
80 and cultivators were divided into four groups namely marginal, small, medium and large sized farm groups.
81 The study revealed that the number of family labour engaged in agriculture bears direct relationship with size of
82 operational holding. However, employment (man equivalent days/acre) bears inverse relationship. The functional
83 relationship revealed that in the case of marginal and small farms, human employment can be supplemented by
84 the more use of mechanical energy, whereas in the case of medium farms the use of humanlabour can be increased
85 some extent within the increased use of chemical energy but in the case of large farms, the use of human-labour
86 was rational and can be increased with more use of chemical as well as mechanical energy.

87 Reddy, A.R. and Sen, C¹⁹ [2004] study was undertaken in the Sone Canal command area of the state
88 of Bihar. A sample of 270 farmers comprising 207 marginal (< 1 hectare), 31 small (1-2 hectares), 22 semi-
89 medium (2-4 hectares) and 10 medium (4-10 hectares) farms were selected through stratified random sampling
90 method. Technical inefficiency of the individual farms was estimated through stochastic frontier production
91 function analysis. This study reveals that the technical inefficiency in rice production decreased with increase
92 in farm size. The average technical inefficiency was highest in marginal farms (27.28%) followed by small farms
93 (22.05%). Minimum average and technical inefficiency was observed in medium group. Technical inefficiency in
94 the production of rice is negatively related with farm size.

95 Jain¹⁰ [1985] made an attempt to examine the interaction between farms size, technology and rural
96 institutions to discover their influence on income distribution. The study reveals that in case of traditional
97 crops or where irrigation and HYV seeds have not been used, little differences in per acre yield existed among
98 various farm size groups. But under jointly managed capital intensive irrigation technology, the per acre yield of
99 the rich and middle farmers was much higher when compared to the poor farmers. Family, it was also observed
100 under individual managed labour intensive irrigation technology the per acre yield of the poor farmers was much
101

102 higher than that of the rich and middle farmers. The study, therefore, suggested that the technology suited for
103 the poor is promoted, income differences can be minimized.

104 Pritam Singh¹⁵ [1970] made an attempt to examine the economic efficiency of different farm-size groups.
105 He tested the significance of various indicators of economic efficiency within the size groups and farm types.
106 He concluded that there is a direct relationship between farm-size and economic efficiency on tractorised farms
107 only. Moreover, the level of economic efficiency is higher on tractor-operated farms, on bullock-operated farms
108 especially medium and large farms.

109 Debnarayan Sarker and Sudpita De⁵ [2004] study attempted to examine the extent of efficiency under
110 different types of nature and different farm sizes in two types of villages -Technologically Advanced villages and
111 Technologically Backward villages. This study considering all farm sizes in both the type of villages together, it
112 can be said that except the lowest farm size where all farms are efficient, the proportion of efficient farm increase
113 with the increase of farm size. This analysis shows that the use of high technological inputs in Agriculture is not
114 so important in improving the efficiency level of the farms. This might suggest that only high use of technical
115 inputs like irrigation, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizer per unit of land does not necessarily bring about maximum
116 possible output for a given set of inputs, nor does it only make 'best practice' relationship between inputs and
117 outputs.

118 Srinivasa Gowda, Basavaraj Bankar, Basvaraj and Hugar²⁶ [1988] studied the productivity differences
119 between small and large farms by analyzing the parameters of their respective production functions. The study
120 revealed that the productivity differences between small and large farms were largely attributable to the existing
121 technology. The author found that the level of output use had a relative significant influence on productivity
122 difference. Large farms were found to have a technological advantage over small farms under irrigated conditions,
123 while the reverse was true under unirrigated conditions. The study concluded that an improvement in technology
124 appropriate for them but also an increase in their access to the modern agricultural inputs.

125 Venkatesam Naidu and Venkateswarlu²⁸ [1988] discussed the resource use efficiency on maize farms in
126 Karimnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. They adopted Cobb-Douglas Production Function to study the resource
127 use efficiency of sample farms. The authors identify in the case of maize production, contribution of family
128 labour and total cost of cultivation decrease with increase in farm size. Small farmers used more manures and
129 less fertilizers, whereas medium and large farmers used more fertilizers and less manure. It is also observed that
130 the average yield of hybrid maize was more on small farms and decreased as the farm size increased. Cost of
131 production was the lowest in small farms. Singh and Pandey²⁵ [1971] studied the resource use efficiency in a
132 dry farming area of Banda district of Uttar Pradesh. The study concluded that the farmers are handicapped
133 with inadequacy of growth promoting inputs such as manure, fertilizer and irrigation facilities and are using the
134 conventional input, labour in excessive quantity due to non-availability of other nonfarmer employment opportunity.
135 The author observed that the new technology of high yielding variety was still in its infancy owing to the un
136 assured irrigation facilities. Therefore, policy for the growth of this dry farming area of crop thriving under
137 low rain-fed conditions and adequate provision for credit and non-farm employment is made for raising the farm
138 productivity and for uplifting the standard of living of the people in the region.

139 5 III.

140 6 Objective of the Study

141 The following is the objective of the study:

142 ? To study the Agricultural resource use efficiency of input factors in different size-level farms in three revenue
143 mandals of Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh.

144 IV.

145 7 Data and Methodology

146 The following methodology is adopted to study the above objective. The present study extends over Nellore
147 district of Andhra Pradesh. A multistage random sampling design was used. We purposefully selected three
148 mandals, Namely Kaligiri, Muttukur and Pellakur of Nellore District at the first stage and later with help of
149 random sampling ten to twelve villages were selected from each Mandal. After the selection of villages a complete
150 list of agricultural families was prepared. As it is generally believed that the technology was sizebased, the list of
151 farmers was further divided into three categories of farms defined as under; 0.00 acres -2.50 acres : small farms
152 2.51 acres -5.00 acres : medium farms 5.01 acres and above : large farms From the sub-divided list of farmers
153 15-20 farmers were selected from each village for preparing a sample of 420 farmers taking for Kaligiri, Muttukur
154 and Pellakur mandals. Data was collected for the explanatory and explained variables with the help of survey
155 method through personal interviews of the farmers selected through mixed sampling for this study relating to
156 the agricultural year 2004-2005.

157 8 a) Specification of Variables

158 A great deal of caution is essential in the selection, classification and aggregation of input variables used in the
159 production process for studying resources productivity. Different researchers have classified and aggregated farm

160 inputs in different ways suitable for their studies. Various ways of classifying and aggregating input variables
161 in production function studies together with a brief description of variables used as explanatory variables in the
162 present study are giving below.

163 i. Bullock-Labour Preparation of farm is an important agricultural work and bullock-power have been taken as
164 an explanatory variable by a number of writers. Chaudhari4 [1962], Eddy and Sen20 [2004], Hopper9 [1965]
165 and Radhakrishna16 [1962] have used it in terms of plough unit days consisting of one pair of animal-labour
166 day and one human-labour day comprising one plough unit. While Rajkrishna17 [1964], Adal and Singh1
167 [2001] specified this variable in terms of bullock-labour days, Obellow and Desai21 [1966] included a labour
168 with a pair of bullocks. Here, we also include one human-labour. Human-Labour Human-labour too, has been used
169 as an explanatory variable in the estimation of production functions either in physical units of time or in value
170 of terms. Shan22 [1969] and Goyal7 [2003] used all human labour while, Hopper9 [1965] and Mathur11
171 [1960] used all human-labour except those associated with plough unit in value terms. Sharma and Sharma23
172 [2000], Hanumantha Rao8 [1965], Rajkrishna17 [1964], Singh24 [1975] and Eswara Prasad6 [1988] have
173 used all human-labour in terms of man-days. We also include human-labour as an explanatory variable but from
174 it exclude those labourers who are engaged in traditional irrigation work and are associated with bullock units.
175 Variable is specified in terms of rupees.

176 iii. HYV Seeds A few writers have used seeds as explanatory variable in their functions. Prasad14 [1973],
177 Debnarayan [1973] and Sudptia De5 [2004] used seeds as a separate explanatory variable in his study terms of
178 expenditure on seeds. We also include seeds in our functions, the prices of seeds are determined at the prevailing
179 market price of the seeds at the seeding time.

180 9 iv. Irrigation

181 Assured and effective irrigation which has been one of the most important factors in the production function
182 studies. Rajkrishna17 [1964], Timothy and Krishna [1990] has specified this variable in terms of
183 expenses on irrigation. We also specify it in the same term. Expenses on irrigation include permanent of wages
184 to labourers used in traditional system of irrigation, water charges paid to the Government for the use of state
185 tube-wells, hire-price of the water received from private tube-wells and pumping sets. Expenses also include
186 accounting prices for the water received from farmers own pumping sets and tube-wells.

187 10 v. Fertilizer

188 Fertilizer is one of the most important components in Agricultural Production. Parikh13 [1996] and Shan22
189 [1969] [1969] [1969] have used chemical fertilizers as separate variable, while Basak and
190 [1954-1957] has included manure along with chemical fertilizers as an explanatory variable. Adav
191 and Gangwar29 [1986] considered various categories of chemical fertilizers as independent explanatory variables.
192 In the present study, though category-wise chemical fertilizer is not taken, chemical fertilizers and pesticides
193 and natural fertilizers are specified as separate variables, and taken in value terms. While expenses on chemical
194 fertilizer are the actual expenses, help of accounting price has been taken to determine the expenses on traditional
195 fertilizers, like seen manure, compost burnt of waste goods and cow-dewing.

196 vi. Plant Protection Plant protection measures are included as explanatory variable. Prasad14 [1973] and
197 Adal and Singh1 [2001] taken them in terms of expenditure on their use. In our study also this variable is
198 specified in terms of actual expenditure.

199 V.

200 11 Model Specification

201 By studying the Marginal Value Products of factors of production, we can assess by their relative importance of
202 factors of production. Marginal Value Product of X_i , the i th input is estimated by the following formula:
$$MVP_i = \frac{Y}{X_i} \cdot \frac{dY}{dX_i}$$

203) i i i X . M . G Y . M . G X MVP ? =
204 Where, G.M. (Y_i) and G.M. (X_i) represent the geometric means of output and input respectively, β_i is the
205 regression Co-efficient of i th input.

206 12 VI.

207 13 Results and Discussions a) Kaligiri Mandal

208 A comparison of marginal value product and marginal cost of an input gives a valid estimation of its (inputs)
209 efficiency in the allocation production process. Hence, the ratios of marginal value products and factor cost*
210 pertaining to Kaligiri mandal were depicted in table 1 for all six-groups under study. i.

211 14 Small Farms

212 From table 1, it is observed that the ratios of Marginal Value Products (MVP) and Marginal Cost (MC) of
213 human-labour, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods are greater than unity and
214 it indicates the underutilization of the variables. The ratios of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, HYV

215 seeds and manures are less than unity, there by indicating over utilization of the said variables. Hence in small
216 farms, the technological input variables chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods
217 were underutilized whereas expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds were over utilized.
218 ii.

219 **15 Medium Farms**

220 The ratios of MVP and MC of the variables human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other
221 plant protection methods are observed to be greater than unity. Hence, the medium size farmers are under
222 utilizing the above factors. The ratios of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds are less than
223 unity. Therefore, one can say that the medium size farmers are utilizing bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor
224 and HYV seeds excessively.

225 Table ?? : Ratios of Marginal Value Products of Input Factor to their Marginal Cost iii.

226 **16 Large Farms**

227 In case of the factors human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection
228 methods, the MVP and MC ratios are found to be greater than unity. It indicates under utilization of human-
229 labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods. The ratios of MVP and
230 MC of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds are observed to be less than unity. It is noticed
231 that the excessive utilization of these variables bullock-labour, tractor expenditure and HYV seeds.

232 In the case of small farms while bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds are marginally
233 underutilized, use of human-labour, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods are
234 deficient. Hence the pattern of resource use in small farm needs some modification, particularly, in application of
235 human-labour, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods which may be increased. In
236 the case of medium farms, bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds are marginally underutilized,
237 use of chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are deficient. Hence,
238 the pattern of resource use in medium farms needs some modification in particularly, application of chemical
239 fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased. In the case of large
240 farms, use of humanlabour, chemicals fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods
241 are insufficient. The pattern of resource use in large farms needs some modification, particularly, application of
242 bullock-labour, HYV seeds, expenditure on tractor and they may be raised.

243 **17 b) Muttukur Mandal**

244 A comparison of marginal value product and marginal cost of an input gives a valid estimation of its (inputs)
245 efficiency in the allocation production process. Hence, the ratios of marginal value products and factor cost*
246 pertaining to Muttukur mandal were depicted in table 2 for all six-groups under study. i.

247 **18 Small Farms**

248 From table 2, the ratios of MVP and MC of expenditure on tractor human-labour, HYV seeds, chemical
249 fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are greater than unity. This indicates
250 the underutilization of these variables. The ratio of MVP and MC of bullock-labour is less than unity, thereby
251 indicating overutilization of these variables. Hence, in small farms the technological input variablesexpenditure
252 on tractor, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods were underutilized.
253 ii.

254 **19 Medium Farms**

255 The ratios of MVP and MC of expenditure on tractor, human-labour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and manures
256 are greater than unity and this indicates the underutilization of these variables. The rations of MVP and MC is
257 less than unity in the case of bullocklabour and pesticides and other plant protection methods. This indicates
258 that the medium size farmers are utilizing chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods
259 excessively.
260 iii.

261 **20 Large Farms**

262 The ratios of MVP and MC of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, human-labour, chemical fertilizers and
263 pesticides and other plant protection methods are greater than unity. It indicates the underutilization of the
264 above variables. The ratios of HYV seeds and manures are less than unity, thereby indicating overutilization of
265 these variables.

266 In the case of small farms, human-labour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant
267 protection methods are deficient. Hence, the pattern of resource use in small farms needs some modification,
268 particularly, application of human-labour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant
269 protection methods may be increased. In the case of medium farms bullock-labour, chemical fertilizers and

pesticides and other plant protection methods are marginally utilized, use of expenditure on tractor, human-labour, HYV seeds and manures are deficient. Hence the pattern of resources use in medium farms needs some modification, particularly, application of expenditure on tractor, human-labour, HYV seeds and manures may be increased. In the case of large farms, while HYV seeds and manures are marginally utilized, use of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, humanlabour and pesticides and other plant protection methods are deficient. Hence the pattern of resource use in large farms needs some modification, particularly, application of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, human-labour and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased.

21 c) Pellakur Mandal

A comparison of marginal value product and marginal cost of an input gives a valid estimation of its (inputs) efficiency in the allocation production process. Hence, the ratios of marginal value products and factor cost* pertaining to Pellakur mandal were depicted in table 3 for all six-groups under study. ii.

22 Medium Farms

The ratios of MVP and MC of all variables bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and pesticides and other plant protection methods are observed to be less than unity and hence the medium size farms are overutilizing the above said variables. Whereas humanlabour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and manures are found to be greater than unity. Hence, these variables are underutilized. iii.

23 Large Farms

The ratios of MVP and MC of human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are found to be greater than unity. This indicates underutilization of human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods. The ratios of MVP and MC of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, and HYV seeds are observed to be less than unity. This indicates that the large size farmers are utilizing bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds excessively.

In the case of small farms while HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers are marginally underutilized, use of expenditure on tractor, human-labour, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are deficient. Hence the pattern of resource use in small farms needs some modification, particularly, expenditure on tractor, human-labour, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased. In the case of medium farms while bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and pesticides and other plant protection methods are overutilized, use of humanlabour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are deficient. Hence the pattern of resource use in medium farms needs some modification, particularly, application of human labour, HYV seeds, chemical fertilizers and manures may be increased. IN the case of large farms use of human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods are deficient. Therefore the pattern of resource use in large farms needs some modification, particularly, application human-labour, chemical fertilizers, manures and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased and bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds and are may be decreased.

24 VII.

25 Conclusions a) Kaligiri Mandal

In the case of small farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is found that the pattern of resource use in small farms needs some modifications, particularly, in the application of technological factors. Chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased where as the application of HYV seeds and may be decreased to obtain more output.

In the case of medium farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors, it is found that the pattern of resource use in medium farms needs some modifications, particularly, in application of technological factors -chemical fertilizers and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased whereas the application of HYV seeds, expenditure on tractor may be decreased to obtain more output.

In the case of large farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is noticed that the pattern of resource use in large farms needs some modification, particularly in the application of technological factors. The pesticides and other plant protection methods, chemical fertilizers may be increased and expenditure on tractor and HYV seeds may be reduced to obtain more output.

26 b) Muttukur Mandal

In the case of small farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is found that the pattern of resource use in small farms needs some modifications, particularly, in the application of technological factors -expenditure on tractor, chemical fertilizers, pesticides and other plant protection methods and HYV seeds may be increased to obtain more output.

In the case of medium farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of input factors it is found that the pattern of resource use in medium farms of Muttukur mandal needs some modifications, particularly in the application of

326 technological factors. The expenditure on tractor, HYV seeds may be increased whereas application of pesticides
 327 and other plant protection methods, chemical fertilizers may be decreased to obtain more output.

328 In the case of large farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the large farms needs some modifications,
 329 particularly in the application of technological factors. The expenditure on tractor, chemical fertilizers and
 330 pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased whereas HYV seeds may be decreased to obtain
 331 more output.

332 27 c) Pellakur Mandal

333 In the case of small farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is found that the pattern
 334 of resource use in small farms needs some modifications, particularly in the application of technological factors.
 335 The expenditure on tractor and pesticides and other plant protection methods may be increased where as the
 336 application of HYV seeds and chemical fertilizers may be decreased to obtain more output.

337 28 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

338 Volume XIV Issue V Version I Year ()

339 In the case of medium farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is found that
 340 the pattern of resource use in medium farms of Pellakur mandal needs some modifications, particularly in the
 341 application of technological factors. The factors chemical fertilizers, HYV seeds may be increased whereas the
 342 application of pesticides and other plant protection methods and expenditure on tractor may be decreased to
 343 obtain more output.

344 In the case of large farms, on the basis of ratios of MVP and MC of the input factors it is found that the pattern
 345 of resource use in large farms needs some modifications. The use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and other plant
 346 protection methods may be increased whereas HYV seeds and expenditure on tractor may be decreased to obtain
 more output. ¹

2

Input	Description of Inputs	MVP	Small Farms MC	Ratio	Muttukur Mandal Medium Farms MVP MC
X1	Bullock-labour	-0.38643	1.000	-0.38643	-1.44425
					1.000 - 1.44425
X2	Expenditure on Tractor	-1.54688	1.000	-1.54688	3.38376
X3	Human-labour	6.65293	1.000	6.65293	8.67617
X4	HYV Seeds	2.01896	1.000	2.01896	3.03605
X5	Chemical Fertilizers	6.58576	1.000	6.58576	0.80261
X6	Manures	1.67394	1.000	1.67394	2.46767
X7	Pesticide and other Protection Plant Expenditure	3.73766	1.000	3.73766	-0.02256
					1.000 - 0.02256

Figure 1: Table 2 :

347

¹© 2014 Global Journals Inc. (US)

3

Inputs	Description of Inputs	MVP	Small Farms	MC	Ratio	Pellakur Medium MVP MC Ratio	Mandal Farms Ratio					
X1	Bullock-labour	1.02091	1.000	1.02091	-2.00063	1.000	-2.00063	0.38195	1.000	0.38195		
X2	Expenditure on Tractor	3.55011	1.000	3.55011	-1.02766	1.000	-1.02766	0.00038	1.000	0.00038		
X3	Human-labour	4.89704	1.000	4.89704				2.12717	1.000	2.12717	1.61219	1.000
X4	HYV Seeds	-0.64578			1.000	0.64578		4.24052	1.000	4.24052	0.21371	1.000
X5	Chemical Fertilizers	-0.88297			1.000	0.88297		15.43535	1.000	15.43535	7.34598	1.000
X6	Manures	9.40139	1.000	9.40139				2.22012	1.000	2.22012	6.35182	1.000
X7	Pesticide and other Protection Plant Expenditure	2.05467	1.000	2.05467	-4.06256	1.000	-4.06256	4.41449	1.000	4.41449		

Small Farms

From table 3, we observed that the ratios of Marginal Value Products (MVP) and Marginal Cost (MC) of bullock-labour, expenditure on tractor, human-labour, manures and pesticides and other plant protection

methods are greater underutilization of the process. The ratios of fertilizers are less than the underutilization of these vari

Figure 2: Table 3 :

- 348 [Journal of Agricultural Economics (April-June)] , *Journal of Agricultural Economics* April-June. 30 (2) p. .
- 349 [Shan ()] *A Socio-Economic Study of progressive and less progressive Farms in Varanasi District*, S L Shan .
- 350 1969. U.P. -Agricultural University (Research Project) (Pant Maurer)
- 351 [Robellow and Desai (1966)] 'A Study of Efficiency of Production of Wheat in Kanjhawala Block'. M S P
- 352 Robellow , D K Desai . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 1966. April-June. p. .
- 353 [Hanumantha Rao ()] *Agricultural Production Functions -Costs and Returns*, C H Hanumantha Rao . 1965.
- 354 Bombay: India Asian Publishing House.
- 355 [Hopper ()] 'Allocation Efficiency in Traditional Indian Agriculture'. W D Hopper . *Journal of Farm Economics*
- 356 1965. 47 (3) .
- 357 [Eswara Prasad et al. (1988)] 'An Econometric Analysis of Cotton Production in Guntur District of Andhra
- 358 Pradesh'. Y Eswara Prasad , C Srirama Murthy , G Satyanarayana , K C Chennarayudu . & *Lalith Acoth*
- 359 1988. October-December. p. . (Margin)
- 360 [Yadav and Gangwar (1986)] 'Economics of Technological Change in Rice Production'. R N Yadav , A C Gangwar
- 361 . *Economic Affairs* 1986. September. 31 (3) .
- 362 [Jain (1985)] 'Effects of Technological and Institutional Factors on Income Distribution in Farm Sector of
- 363 Bangladesh'. W M H Jain . *Economic Affairs* 1985. June. 30 (2) p. .
- 364 [Sharma and Sharma (2000)] 'Farm Size -Productivity Relationship: Empirical Evidence from on Agriculturally
- 365 Developed Region of Himachal Pradesh'. H R Sharma , R K Sharma . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*
- 366 2000. October-December. 55 (4) p. .
- 367 [Singh (1970)] 'Farm Size and Economic Efficiency in the Cotton Belt Area of Punjab'. Pritam Singh . *Economic*
- 368 *Affairs* 1970. January-February. 23 (1-2) p. .
- 369 [Sarker et al. (2004)] 'High Technical Efficiency of Farms in two Different Agricultural Lands: A Study under
- 370 Determine Production Frontier Approach'. Dehnanarayan Sarker , Sudpita , De . *Indian Journal of Agricultural*
- 371 *Economics* 2004. April-June. 59 (2) .
- 372 [Bhatia and Dutta (1987)] *Impact of Energy use on Employment in Agriculture. Agricultural situation in India*,
- 373 R C Bhatia , V K Dutta . 1987. December. p. .
- 374 [Chaudhari ()] 'Optimum combination of comparative crops in the intensive cultivation scheme area Delhi'. T P
- 375 S Chaudhari . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 1962. 17 (1) .
- 376 [Srinivasa Gowda et al. (1988)] 'Productivity Difference between Small and Large Farms -An Econometric
- 377 Evidence'. M V Srinivasa Gowda , Basavaraj Bankar , K Basvaraj , L B Hugar . *Agricultural Situation*
- 378 *in India* 1988. January. p. .
- 379 [Timothy and Moorthy (1990)] 'Productivity Variation and water use in Farms of Madurantakam Tankfed Area
- 380 of Changal Pattu District'. O Timothy , S Moorthy . *Tamil Nadu. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*
- 381 1990. January-March. XLV.
- 382 [Parikh (1996)] 'Rates of returns on Chemical Fertilizers in the Package Programme Districts'. A Parikh . *Indian*
- 383 *Journals of Agricultural Economics* 1996. April-June. 21 (2) p. .
- 384 [Basak and Choudhary ()] 'Report for the Years 1954-1957, Directorate of Economic and Statistics'. K C Basak
- 385 , B K Choudhary . *Ministry of Food and Agriculture*, (New Delhi) 1954-1957. (Studies in the Economics of
- 386 Farm Management in West Bengal)
- 387 [Prasad ()] *Resource use Efficiency and level of production in Multiple cropping in Farrukhabad District in U.P.*
- 388 *An un Published Ph*, V Prasad . 1973. Manpet. C.S. Azad University (D. Thesis)
- 389 [Singh and Pandey (1971)] 'Resource Use Efficiency in a Dry Farming Area of Banda District of Utter Pradesh'.
- 390 L R Singh , L R Pandey . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 1971. October-December. 22 (4) p. .
- 391 [Venkatesam et al. ()] 'Resource Use Efficiency on Maize Farms in Karimnagar District of Andhra Pradesh'. P
- 392 Venkatesam , M R Naidu , V Venkateswarlu . *The Andhra Agricultural Journal* 1988. 33 (2) p. .
- 393 [Singh and Patel (1973)] 'Returns to Scale Farm and Productivity in Meerut District'. Rajvir Singh , R K Patel
- 394 . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 1973. April-June. 28 (2) p. .
- 395 [Radhakrishna ()] 'Share of Fixed Factors of Production in the Net Earning from Agriculture in West Godavari
- 396 District'. D Radhakrishna . *A.P.). Arthavijnana* 1962. 4 (2) .
- 397 [Rajkrishna (1964)] 'Some Production Functions for Punjab'. Rajkrishna . *Indian Journal of Agricultural*
- 398 *Economics* 1964. July-December. 19 (3&4) p. .
- 399 [Mathur ()] 'Studies in the Economics of Farm Management in Madya Pradesh, Report for the year 1956-1957.
- 400 Directorate of Economics and Statistics'. P N Mathur . *Ministry of Food and Agriculture*, (New Delhi) 1960.
- 401 [Goyal (2003)] 'Supply Response and Input Demand on Paddy Farms in Haryana'. S K Goyal . *India -A Panel*
- 402 *Data Analysis* 2003. April-June. 58.

- 403 [Mythili and Shanmugam (2000)] 'Technical Efficiency of Rice Growers in Tamilnadu: A Study Based on Panel
404 Data'. G Mythili , K R Shanmugam . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2000. January-March. 55 (1)
405 p. .
- 406 [Reddy and Sen (2004)] 'Technical Inefficiency in Rice Production and its relationship with Farm -Specific Socio-
407 Economic Characteristics'. A R Reddy , C Sen . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2004. April-June.
408 59 (2) p. .
- 409 [Reddy and Sen (2004)] 'Technical Inefficiency in Rice Production and its Relationship with Farm-Specific Socio-
410 Economic Characteristics'. A R Reddy , C Sen . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2004. April-June.
411 59 (2) p. .
- 412 [Badal and Singh (2001)] 'Technological Change in Maize Production: A Case Study of Bihar'. P S Badal , R P
413 Singh . *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2001. April-June. 56 (2) .