

Original Research Article

Effects of the agro-net technology on management and financial profitability of cabbage and pepper production systems in Benin

ABSTRACT

Aims: Chemical pesticides have been the main option for pest control adopted so far by vegetable growers in Benin, in spite of the health risks involved. In order to reduce such risks, researchers developed insect nets (called agro-net technology), as a means of physical pest control. This study aimed to analyze the financial profitability of the use of that technology in cabbage and pepper production, so as to advice on its better management and enable greater adoption.

Study design: Comparison was made of key indicators of resource management and financial profitability of a farm (productivity, profit ratio), among users and non-users of insect nets in the main vegetable production systems in southern Benin.

Place and Duration of Study: Benin's National Institute of Agricultural Research (INRAB), in collaboration with the Faculty of Agronomic Sciences (FSA), from 2010 to 2011.

Methodology: Stratified and random sampling and a structured questionnaire were used to collect data from 205 farmers (including 20% insect net users and 80% non-users) in Mono and Couffo departments of Benin. Component analysis, K-means, cluster analysis, Student's T test were used to identify the different vegetable production systems. Crop budgeting was used to evaluate and compare resource management indicators (labor and capital productivity) and profitability indicators (gross revenue, cost of production, net revenue, benefit/cost ratio) between these systems.

Results: Three vegetable production systems were distinguished in the study area: intensive system, semi-intensive system and extensive system. Only 20% vegetables growers use insect nets; they practice intensive and semi-intensive systems. The technology improved profitability, only for cabbage in the intensive system where the benefit/cost ratio and capital productivity increased slightly by 15.6%. On the contrary, due to large increases in labor costs, pepper production using the nets in intensive and semi-intensive systems led to 42.8% and 25.7% profit reductions. Decreases in labor productivity worth 48.3% and 72.6% were also observed.

Conclusion: Overall the agro-net or insect net technology increased labor costs, while output values did not increase more than proportionally. The study provides evidence that an agricultural technology should substantially reduce labor costs and improve labor productivity before it can be widely adopted by farmers, especially the poor. Technology adaptation to crops' specific growth requirements is also needed to go beyond existing productivity and profitability advantages.

38

39 *Keywords: insects net, agro-net technology, vegetables production system, financial profitability, labor*
40 *productivity.*

41

42

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and justification

Urban and Suburban Agriculture (UPA) is developing fast in sub-Saharan Africa due to urban population growth. It is a means to address diversity in urban food supply (Olanrewaju et al., 2004). Considering the low performance of rural production systems, UPA is presented as an option to face urban food insecurity (Tinker, 1998; Hounkponou, 2003), and vegetable production has become therefore **an interesting economic opportunity** (Singbo et al., 2004). In Benin, vegetable production is an important source of employment in urban and suburban areas, mostly in some rivers banks and valleys (Tiamiyou, 1995); it contributes to the creation of nearly 60,000 direct jobs and 25,000 indirect jobs (PADAP, 2003). Moreover, it plays an important role in the economy, because of its high income potential. For this reason, the Government of Benin has identified vegetables as one of the twelve priority sub-sectors to be promoted in the Strategic Plan for Boosting the Agricultural Sector **2011**. In addition to its social and economic importance, vegetable production is also useful to enhance food and nutrition security. Vegetables provide various nutrient supplements in Benin people's diets, which were previously mainly based on starchy foods (Amoussougbo, 1993).

However, the vegetable sub-sector in Benin is facing many difficulties. Previous studies (Tiamiyou, 1995; Adegbola and Singbo, 2001) mentioned among **others**, the following main constraints in southern Benin: land scarcity, shortage of specific agricultural inputs (seeds and fertilizers), poor water control, lack of credit and pest attacks. Generally in sub-Saharan Africa, insect and mite pests are a major cause of yield loss in vegetable crops (Olanrewaju et al., 2004). To ensure pest control on these crops, farmers frequently spray chemical insecticides, often with increasing doses of unapproved products. This could lead to the presence of chemical residues in crops and in the environment (soil and ground water) on the one hand, and would affect both public and animal health on the other hand.

The use of insect nets is expected to reduce the costs of pesticide use, thereby preserving the environment and public health. **Insect nets were found to be efficient in fighting *Plutella xylostella* attacks on cabbage in Benin. *Plutella xylostella* (diamondback moth) is particularly resistant to insecticides in South Africa (Charleston et al., 2006). *Cecidomyie* of cabbage and *bok choy* are terrible insects that are quite unmanageable without insect nets. Dull bug and *chrysomela* (or golden beetle) on pepper, tomato and cucumber can also be controlled efficiently with insect nets (Villeneuve, 2014).**

This article aims to assess the potential viability of this technology, by evaluating the financial gain of its use compared to existing plant protection systems.

1.2 Literature review

1.2.1 Brief overview of some key concepts

A **production system** is a particular arrangement of inputs, technical choice, and a combination of productions (Chombart Lauwe and Poitevin, 1957; Reboul, 1976). In Benin vegetables are produced in various production systems. They include modern gardening systems as a market-oriented and continuous farming activity, and lowlands or flood recession systems where vegetables are cultivated intensively, continuously or periodically as seasonal production (Tiamiyou, 2002). They are urban or suburban production systems and they use manual or motorized irrigation. Pepper ranks second (about 70% of growers) among vegetables produced, and has therefore deserved a considerable attention among producers and government extension services (Adegbola et al., 2004; Singbo et al., 2004). Cabbage is rather an exotic crop, produced by only 30% of growers (Koukponou et al., 2010).

The economic analysis of production systems aims to identify and disseminate best practices and monitor their impact, and to identify regional priorities for rural investment and research (Dixon and Gulliver, 2001). It provides the ground for cost-effective agricultural development interventions, and improved livelihoods for target groups. It is done in this paper using the concepts of production efficiency, productivity and profitability.

Productivity is a direct expression of **production efficiency**. It is an 'output/input' ratio, either in physical or monetary terms; it is therefore referred to as technical efficiency or economic efficiency respectively. Marginal productivity, which is the marginal effect of the last unit of input, is a critical determinant of production decision-making. Indeed, optimal production is determined at the point on the production curve where marginal productivity equals marginal cost. When several inputs or production factors are considered, the input-output relationship is expressed by a multiple-factor production function, the most frequently used being the Cobb-Douglas or the Mitscherlich production function¹. It is used to determine partial productivity of each factor, and the overall economic efficiency, which is called allocative efficiency. It is assessed through production function modelling. The present study will not do such modelling, which should rely on long-term field experiments with appropriate randomization. It rather assesses average productivity and financial profitability of vegetable production systems using mean values of cross-section data.

¹ In economics, a production function represents the relationship between the output and the combination of factors, or inputs, used to obtain it: $Q=f(L,K)$. The Cobb-Douglas production function is a particular form of the production function: $Q(L,K) = A L^{\beta} K^{\alpha}$. It is widely used because it has many attractive characteristics (<http://economicpoint.com/production-function/cobb-douglas>). Nijland et al. (2008) provided a discussion on integrating the Mitscherlich function with biological plant growth functions.

Financial profitability is the "capacity" of a business to provide income that is commensurate with invested capital². It expresses the magnitude of profit; the latter is the result of business management capacities and conditions. It is the first necessary condition for the firm's survival; it is the "raison d'être" of the firm. While profitability justifies and drives business, it also helps evaluate the performance of resources invested by investors (FAO, 2005). Financial profitability is the business opportunity indicator most widely used. Benefit/cost ratio and internal rate of return stand for it. They are calculated respectively for short-term investments and multi-year projects. They both represent a profit ratio, which corresponds in the first case to productivity (expressed as a ratio of monetary values) minus 1.

1.2.2 Some previous works on profitability of vegetables production in West Africa and Benin

Kouvonou et al. (1999) found that the vegetable sub-sector development in Togo is stimulated by an increase in unemployment rate among young men and women, a strong demand for produce, and an attractive production profit. The differences between types and kinds of growers can influence the mode of vegetable farm management, but they were not significant in most cases. However, men more than women substitute hired labor for fertilizer in the allocation of production resources. Vegetable production is highly lucrative, but it is also very sensitive to the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers. These inputs may become inaccessible, due respectively to scarcity and high prices. Organic fertilizer scarcity results from non-systematic production and reliance on erratic harvesting of city wastes. High prices of inorganic fertilizers is due to thinness of distribution networks.

Adegbola et al. (2004) assessed the financial profitability of vegetables in various production systems in southern Benin. In pepper production, highest profits were observed with "medium producers, Naguézé pump users" and "small producers, pump users " while only "small producers, pump users " had the highest profits in tomato production. The use of an irrigation system, relatively manageable farm size and plant geometry (erected vs. rampant, with related labor costs) appear therefore to be critical drivers of vegetable production's profitability. Using the Policy Analysis Matrix (PAM) developed by Monke and Pearson (1989), Fanou (2008) found that bio-driven improved technologies (improved varieties, biological insecticides, modern irrigation system) did not generally improve the profitability of vegetable production systems. Indeed, tomato production systems in shallows area with local variety and use of cotton insecticide were more profitable than other systems, namely those using biologic pest control. However, cabbage production systems that apply aqueous neem extract and use motorized irrigation were more efficient. Therefore, no constant direction could be observed regarding the efficiency of vegetable production systems that use non-chemical pest control. Apparently, crop specificities in relation with soil fertility requirement and inherent vulnerability to pest attacks (which

² "Capital" can mean many things. Its specific definition depends on the context in which it is used. In general, it refers to financial resources available for use. It may mean 'financial assets or the financial value of assets, such as cash' or 'the factories, machinery and equipment owned by a business and used in production' (<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/capital.asp>). Capital is wealth in the form of money or assets, taken as a sign of the financial strength of an individual, organization, or nation, and assumed to be available for development or investment. In accounting, it is a business to generate income. In economics, it means factors of production that are used to create goods or services and are not themselves in the process (<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/capital.html>).

would determine chemical vs. non-chemical pest control efficiency) are critical determinants of physical productivity, which is a prerequisite for financial profitability. Basic yield determinants seem to have taken precedence on pest control methods in the total efficiency of those vegetable production systems. The yield determinants concerned here include site slope, soil texture, soil fertility, and water availability.

Market demand is also particularly critical for vegetable farming's profitability. For example, cabbage is the vegetable that generates more income to growers; reasons include its trade intensity in the West Africa sub-region and its greater easiness of storage than other vegetables (Adorgloh-Hessou, 2006; Fanou, 2008). There is also a need for growers to increasingly target certain market segments (high-income and snobbish consumers) who have greater willingness to pay more than others for biologically-produced crops. The use of bio-pesticides contributes to increasing such crops' competitiveness in Ghana (IITA, 2002). Hence, marketability (including product quality) is also a critical factor driving the financial profitability of vegetable production systems.

Profitability also determines the adoption of a new agricultural technology, and is the expression of many driving factors pertaining to the farm's business environment and farmers' subjective perceptions on technology characteristics (Honfoga, 1999, 2007; Baidu-Forson, 1995). The present paper assesses the extent to which adoption of insect nets, as an "improved" non-chemical pest control technology, improves the profitability of vegetables' production in Benin. It is a contribution to existing research both on the economics of vegetables production and technology adoption studies.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Selection of sites and crops

A three-stage site selection was made to conduct this study. Firstly, the UPA/PAN³ project intervention areas were targeted as the study area. Secondly, sites where the project's vegetable program (PCM) conducted field trials and pre-extension tests were considered⁴. They include the localities of Seme-Kpodji, Cotonou, Pahou, Ouidah in the Atlantic department; Lokossa Athiémé, Bopa, Houéyogbé, Comé and Grand-Popo in the Mono department; and Dogbo, Lalo, Klouékanmey, and Aplahoué and Toviklin in the Couffo department. Thirdly, Mono and Couffo departments, where the agro-net technology has been first introduced, were selected because quantitative data on producers' knowledge about the technology were already available in the project's database.

Regarding crops' selection, acreage coverage and use of the agro-net technology were considered. Agricultural statistics of Mono-Couffo (2010-2011) indicate that tomato (44.6% of total garden crops area), pepper (30.2%) and leafy vegetables (16.3%) were the most produced vegetables. Insect nets

³ UPA/PAN: Urban and Suburban Agriculture / Pesticide Action Network.

⁴ The PCM program was jointly conducted by the National Institute of Agricultural Research Benin (INRAB), the regional vegetable councils (CRM) and the APECTETRA NGO.

have been tested in Benin first on cabbage, then on pepper and tomato. Hence the choice of cabbage and pepper for this study.

2.2 Sampling and data collection methods

The study sample was selected among vegetable growers of Mono and Couffo departments. Each grower must have been informed about the agro-net technology. Therefore, producers selected for the study sample were drawn from the list of vegetable growers who participated earlier to a training on pest control in vegetable production using insect nets on cabbage, tomato and pepper. As a result, the municipalities of Aplahoué, Athiémé, Bopa, Comé, Djakotomey, Dogbo, Grand-Popo, Houéyogbé, Klouékanmey, Lalo, Lokossa and Toviklin appeared as the localities where the study should be conducted. Two hundred and five (205) farmers were randomly selected as the study sample, after a stratification was made in each locality according to the earlier discrimination (experimenters or new practitioners, experiment observers or hesitant users). Finally, the sample is made of 80% of non-users (experiment observers) and 20% of users (experimenters) of the agro-net technology (Table 1). The proportion of users is low because the technology is new and is at its very early stage of adoption. A large proportion of non-users was included in the sample in order to capture reliable and representative data from growers of the two crops in the agro-net project area, and to arrive at relevant profitability values from non-users that can be compared with those of users.

Table 1: Structure of the study sample

Municipalities	Non users	Agro-net users	Total	Municipalities	Non users	Agro-net users	Total
Aplahoué	36	0	36	Grand-Popo	31	2	33
Athiémé	5	7	12	Houéyogbé	4	4	8
Bopa	8	1	9	Klouékanmey	4	5	9
Comé	25	5	30	Lalo	5	7	12
Djakotomey	0	3	3	Lokossa	3	4	7
Dogbo	35	3	38	Toviklin	8	0	8
Total Sample (number)	164	41	205				
%	80	20	100				

Source: Survey data, September-October 2011.

Semi-structured interviews with individual farmers and group discussions were conducted in August 2011 using an interview guide. In September-October 2011, a detailed questionnaire was used to elicit the data required for the analysis.

2.3 Methods of data analysis

First a typology of vegetable production systems was established to identify the relevant categories of vegetable growers, using the following criteria: area sown during previous crop year (2010), number of years of experience in the activity, household size, number of workers employed, costs of hired labor, seeds, fertilizers and pesticides used during the previous season, and age of the producer. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and classification in dynamic clustering or K-Means Cluster Analysis were

used to identify and describe the different vegetable production systems. K-Means helps to aggregate vegetable growers into different clusters, and PCA helps make the description of each group.

Partial budgeting was used to evaluate and compare financial profitability between the different production systems identified. Accounting profit, which focuses only on explicit costs, was calculated per unit area. Nonetheless, opportunity costs were considered for non-monetary transactions. Variable costs include input costs (fertilizers, pesticides and seeds) and temporary labor wage. Fixed capital consists of tools such as hoes, dabas, watering cans, shovels, wheelbarrows, rakes and machetes. Other costs such as land rents and payments in kind for extension services were not considered. Gross margin was calculated as gross revenue valued at farm gate prices minus variable costs, and net margin is gross margin minus fixed costs. The latter consist of depreciation of all farm tools of more than one year lifetime (hoe, machete, watering pump and insect nets and their installation). The annuity by type of equipment (Am_i) was estimated by the following formula:

$$Am_i = n_i * P_i / D_i$$

where:

Am_i = annuity tools considered in the production of vegetable i;

n_i = number of tools used by the vegetable grower in cabbage and pepper production;

P_i = unit purchase price;

D_i = lifetime of the tool.

In calculating gross revenue for each crop, we assumed that all harvest is completely sold at the selling price declared by the vegetable grower. The Student t test was used to see if there is a significant difference between existing production systems and new technology for average costs and margins per hectare. This test also contributed to identifying the most profitable production system. The most ubiquitous indicator of profitability is the benefit/cost ratio or profit ratio, i.e. the ratio between the net revenue or profit and total production cost.

Comparisons between non-users and users of the agro-net technology in the different production systems were then made, with the aim of apprehending increases in profit ratio provided by the use of the technology. In order to deepen the production efficiency analysis, labor productivity and capital productivity – with and without the use of insect nets – were used as indicators of economic performance of the identified production systems. They were calculated as follows⁵:

- Labor productivity = (Gross revenue - all costs except labor) / number of worker units
- Capital productivity = (Gross revenue - all costs except capital) / Capital

These formula are proxies of marginal productivities (i.e. marginal output of X / quantity of X). In the absence of production functions, marginal output of each production factor (X) was calculated as "Gross revenue – all costs except X". This was done under the assumption that other factors are used

⁵ Please note that number of workers is not exact measure of labor. Man-days is more appropriate and is calculated as: Sum (number of workers*age class coefficient*number of days worked). This formula could not be used in this study because reliable data were not available on number of days worked and age class coefficients in vegetable production.

at the threshold of zero profitability, i.e. their contribution to the total output is exactly equal to their costs. In the multiple factor production function, obviously this would not be the case.

Under that limitation, comparisons between production systems were then made to see the extent to which the use of the agro-net technology improves labor and capital factor productivity. Analysis of variance with the Fisher F test and Student t test were used to see if there is a significant difference between the ratios calculated.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Typology of vegetable crop production systems and differential use of agro-nets

The typology of the vegetable production systems in the study area was established using the criteria previously mentioned. The Fisher F-test was used to identify the main discriminant variables. The most significant variables at the 1% level include: area sown in the previous year 2010, number of agricultural workers, costs of labor and cost of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides. Using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and classification by dynamic clouds (K-Means Cluster Analysis), three production systems were identified: intensive production system, extensive production system and semi-intensive production system.

The intensive production system is practiced by producers in their sixties, with high purchasing power. With large land size and high input use per ha, they are large farmers and have good experience in vegetable production. They support high labor costs and use insect nets. The extensive production system is practiced mostly by small vegetable growers, quite young (22-35), with low use of production factors (land, labor and capital). They do not use insect nets, probably because of high costs associated with the use of the technology. The semi-intensive production system is characterized by moderate use of production factors. Producers in this group are aged 36-60 and also use insect nets. They represent 53% of growers and 11.2% of insect net users, against 22% and 8.8% for intensive growers (Table 2).

Table 2: Distribution of vegetable growers by production system and use/non-use of insect net

Production systems	Without net	With net	TOTAL
Extensive	24,88% (51)	0% (0)	24,88% (51)
Semi-intensive	1,95% (86)	11,22% (23)	53,17% (109)
Intensive	13,17% (27)	8,78% (18)	21,95% (45)
TOTAL	80% (164)	20% (41)	100% (205)

Note: Figures in parentheses are numbers of growers.
Source: Survey data, September-October 2011

3.2 Comparison of farm resource management and financial profitability indicators

Table 3 shows that pepper and cabbage production is profitable in the identified systems. However, the intensity of use of production factors varies greatly from one production system to another. Highest margins were observed with the intensive system and the lowest with the extensive system. However, the benefit/cost ratio of the extensive system (4.13 and 2.65 for pepper and cabbage) was higher than that of other systems, indicating that both crops are highly and more profitable in that system. The limited or non-improved profitability in semi-intensive and intensive systems stems from higher production costs (4-7 times those of the extensive system) with the agro-net technology whereas crop yields and per unit output value did not significantly increase.

In pepper production insect nets are used only in experimental farms and nursery, and not in the real field (farm), probably because the plant's height is such that early installation of the nets – as it is recommended – would impede flowering and disturb the plant's development. Moreover, it would require more net rolls and higher and more arches for their installation. Overall, the use of the agro-net technology in pepper fields is time consuming and labor-demanding, meaning higher production costs than without it. Producers were therefore advised to limit the use of the net only in nursery for this crop. In the case of cabbage, the net is set in nursery and on-farm experimental fields because cabbage plants rest on the floor until flowering.

Some experienced vegetable growers claimed to be satisfied with the use of the net in pepper nursery. The agronomic advantages include protection of plants from damage caused by animals and crickets, and stronger plants for transplanting. But they complained about the presence of whitefly that pass through the mesh, thus causing extra cost of purchasing insecticides for joint treatments. Indeed, according to Simeni Tchuinte (2005), in the field (i.e. real farms) pepper stands out among traditional vegetable crops but producers do not fully benefit from their investments because of diseases caused by insects.

Table 4 shows that gross revenues are significantly improved for both crops with the agro-net technology. However, the use of this technology requires significant initial investments, which producers in extensive systems cannot afford. That's the reason why the profitability analysis is limited to semi-intensive and intensive systems. It appears from this table that the use of insect net in intensive and semi-intensive systems is not more profitable than old production practices of pepper. The benefit/cost ratio is respectively 1.94 and 1.87 for the intensive and semi-intensive production systems without the use of the net, against 1.11 and 1.39 in the same systems with the use of the net, i.e. respectively 42.8% and 25.7% profit reductions. On the contrary, cabbage production under insect nets is more profitable with the nets in both systems. The benefit/cost ratio is respectively 1.86 and 1.87 for the semi-intensive production system without and with the use of the net. For the intensive production system, corresponding figures are 1.57 and 1.93. In addition, the use of net reduces pesticide costs. This result confirms previous findings (Martin et al., 2006; Assogba et al., 2010). Regarding economic performance, Table 3 also shows that labor productivity has not improved with the nets in both systems for cabbage and pepper production. Indeed, significant decreases in labor

productivity appear between 'without' and 'with the technology' for pepper production in both semi-intensive and intensive production systems. Compared to non-users, labor productivity of users have decreased by 72.6% in the semi-intensive system and by 48.3% in the intensive system. Corresponding figures for cabbage are 34.3% and 12.3%.

The reason is that the use of insect nets demands too much labor, and the recommended technical route is long and tedious. Likewise, the use of insect nets in pepper production does not contribute to improving capital productivity in intensive system and semi-intensive system. Only in cabbage intensive system is capital productivity significantly improved with the use of insect nets, from 2.57 to 2.93, i.e. an increase by 15.6%.

Table 3: Financial profitability and factor productivities of pepper and cabbage production systems without the use of insect nets

Items	Pepper			Cabbage		
	Intensive System	Semi-intensive System	Extensive System	Intensive System	Semi-intensive System	Extensive System
Gross revenue (Fcfa/ha)	3 709 316.3 ±715 666.04 ^a	2 090 550 ±910 221.7 ^b	870 626.3 ±58 689.4 ^c	5 405 568.2 ±869 231.07 ^a	4 631 394.1 ±1 080 222.9 ^b	2 616 194.8 ±171 369.7 ^c
Total production cost (Fcfa/ha)	1 293 187.2 ±263 219.4 ^a	709 978.1 ±91 325.2 ^b	169 855.8 ±35 679.01 ^c	2 104 291.6 ±795 918.6 ^a	1 621 611.9 ±743 441.6 ^b	716 653.4 ±35 820.19 ^c
Net revenue or Profit (Fcfa/ha)	2 416 129.1 ±904 893.28 ^a	1 380 571.9 ±163 7793 ^b	700 770.5 ±46 020.78 ^c	3 301 276.6 ±146 624.94 ^a	3 009 782.2 ±673 562.6 ^b	1 899 541.4 ±271 099.02 ^c
Benefit/Cost ratio (Profit ratio)	1.87^a	1.94^b	4.13^c	1.57^a	1.86^b	2.65^c
Labor productivity (Fcfa/Manday)	4 085.92^a	3 238.19^b	3 562.14^c	5 784.61^a	4 708.15^b	8 030.55^c
Productivity of capital	2.86^a	2.94^b	5.74^c	2.57^a	2.86^b	4.53^c

Notes: a, b and c: level of significance 1%. The means are statistically different from one letter to another at the level of 5%.

343
344

Table 4: Financial profitability and factor productivities of pepper and cabbage production systems with and without insect nets

Items	Pepper				Cabbage			
	Semi-intensive system		Intensive System		Semi-intensive system		Intensive System	
	Without net	With net	Without net	With net	Without net	With net	Without net	With net
Gross revenue (Fcfa/ha)	2 090 550 ±910 221.7	2 626 327 ±878 408	3 709 316.3 ±715 666.04	4 374 700 ±1 172 604	4 631 394.1 ±1 080 222.9	4 996 100 ±687 931	5 405 568.2 ±869 231.07	7 790 500 ±1 090 780
Pesticides (Fcfa/ha)	46 823.5 ^b ±10 005.2	33 206 ±16 ^a 194	66 420.3 ^d ±9 351.1	26 913 ^c ±11 550	113 080.4 ^b ±71 964.5	93 696 ^a ±62 048	204 600 ^d ±86 800	105 299 ^c ±83 025
Labor (Fcfa/ha)	113 448.3 ^b ±10 709.6	495 417 ^a ±103 503	412 536.9 ^d ±36 153.4	866 234 ^c ±179 408	321 225.1 ^b ±109 132.4	502 500 ^a ±187 285	331 370.5 ^d ±171 895.3	763 695 ^c ±291 923
Gross margin (Fcfa/ha)	1 552 576.8 ^a ±832 979.6	1 625 150 ^a ±463 746	2 696 761.1 ^b ±517 626.1	2 921 094 ^b ±264 223	3 196 595.06 ^b ±414 982.02	3 407 155 ^a ±287 970	3 576 617.1 ^d ±156 768.1	5 523 396 ^c ±162 930
Total production cost (Fcfa/ha)	709 978.1 ^b ±91 325.2	1 243 677 ^a ±235 762	1 293 187.2 ^d ±263 219.4	1 833 938 ^c ±430 328	1 621 611.9 ^b ±743 441.6	1 743 836 ^a ±799 463	2 104 291.6 ^d ±795 918.6	2 657 429 ^c ±1 301 500
Net margin or Profit (Fcfa/ha)	1 380 571.8 ^a ±163 779.3	1 382 650 ^a ±450 296	2 416 129.1 ^b ±904893.28	2 540 762 ^b ±231 103	3 009 782.1 ^b ±673 562.6	3 252 264 ^a ±111 532	3 301 276.5 ^d ±146 624.94	5 133 071 ^c ±210 720
Benefit/cost ratio (Profit ratio)	1.94 ^b	1.11 ^a	1.87 ^d	1.39 ^c	1.86 ^b	1.87 ^a	1.57 ^d	1.93 ^c
Labor productivity (Fcfa/Manday)	3 238.19 ^b	1 875.36 ^a	4 085.92 ^d	2 754.66 ^c	4 708.15 ^b	3 504.25 ^a	5 784.61 ^d	5 152.34 ^c
Productivity of capital	2.94 ^b	2.11 ^a	2.86 ^d	2.38 ^c	2.86 ^b	2.87 ^a	2.57 ^d	2.93 ^c

Notes: a and b: level of significance 5%; c and d: level of significance 1%. The means are statistically different from one letter to another at the level of 5%.

345
346

4. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Pepper and cabbage production is profitable in the three production systems, yet only the extensive system offers the most interesting benefit/cost ratio (greater than 3) for both crops. Vegetable growers in the extensive system do not use the agro-net or insect net technology because it involves high initial investments and costly labor use which those farmers cannot afford. The use of agro-net technology in semi-intensive and intensive systems did not improve the profitability of the two crops, except for cabbage in intensive system where the benefit/cost ratio is improved slightly by 15.6%. Likewise, labor productivity in pepper production decreased by 72.6% with the semi-intensive system and 48.3% with the intensive system. The study therefore recommends that vegetable growers adopt the technology for cabbage – and maybe other crops with flat geometry spreading on the floor – in order to improve crop yields and quality through healthy avoidance of insect attacks. Considering the drudgery of work and high labor costs involved in applying current recommendations for using the technology, it appears that correction is required on the technical specifications (the net's design, arches/skeleton for installing it, and optimal adaptation of the technical route) of the technology to producers' farming practices. Only then can the technology be widely adopted, because it will become financially accessible to the extensive system growers (currently 80%) who will then move from their current status of non-users to that of users. They will also derive substantial profits while offering healthy vegetables to fulfill the existing high demand in domestic and regional markets.

REFERENCES

- Adegbola YP, Singbo AG (2001). Bio-pesticide industry's socio-economic analysis in vegetable crops in Benin, PAPA / INRAB / IITA-Cotonou, Benin, 30 p.
- Adesina AA, Baidu-Forson, J (1995). Farmers' perceptions and adoption of new agricultural technology: evidence from analysis in Burkina Faso and Guinea, West Africa. *Agricultural Economics* 13 (1995) 1-9
- Adorgloh-Hessou RA (2006). Guide for the development of production system and marketing of quality vegetables in the urban and suburban regions of Southern Benin, Consultancy report, IITA-Benin, 82p.
- Amoussougbo Y (1993). Survey on the use of pesticides in vegetables' production in the fight against plant skin-eroding worms. Thesis of Engineer in Agronomic Sciences, FSA/UNB, 134p.
- APRM (2010). Diagnostic, challenges and issues in the agricultural sector: Location of major agricultural products. In: PSRSA, pp 8-9.
- Assogba-Komlan F, Martin T, Sidick I, Ahle V, Chandre F (2010). An acaricide-treated net to control phytophagous mites. *Crop Protection*, 29 (5): 470-475.
- Charleston DS, Kfir R, Dicke M, Vet LEM (2006). Impact of botanical extracts derived from *Melia azedarach* and *Azadirachta indica* on populations of *Plutella xylostella* and its natural enemies: A Weld test of laboratory findings. In: *Biological Control*, available online at www.sciencedirect.com.
- Chombart de Lauwe J, Poitevin J (1957). *Farm Management*, Paris, Dunod, 222p.
- Coulibaly O, Nkamleu BG (2004). Training Manual on econometric analysis models to agricultural economists, IITA, 28p.

- Diouf M, Diop M, Lo C, Drame K, Sene E, Ba C, Gueye, M, Faye B (1999). Prospecting traditional leafy vegetables African type Senegal. In: JA Chweya and Eyzaguiere P (eds) Biodiversity of traditional leafy vegetables in Africa. Rome, Italy: International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) 111-150.
- Dixon J, Gulliver A (2001). Farming Systems and Poverty: Improving farmers' livelihoods in a changing world, FAO/World Bank, 46p.
- Fanou L (2008). Financial and economic profitability of vegetable production systems in southern Benin: case of tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum*) and cabbage (*Brassica oleracea*), Thesis for graduation as Engineer in Agronomics Sciences, FSA / UAC, 136p.
- FAO (2005). Profitability and sustainability of urban and suburban agriculture, 83p.
- Gonroudobou OD (1984). The economy of vegetable production in the outskirts of Porto-Novo, Benin, Thesis for graduation as Engineer in Agronomics Sciences, FSA / UNB 115p.
- Habault P (1983). Glossary of Agricultural and Horticultural terms: scientific, technical and economic, JB Bailliere, Paris, 151p.
- Honfoga BG (1999). Farmers' Perceptions of Soil Fertility Resulting from the Adoption of Improved Farm Technologies in Southern Togo, In: Debrah SK, Koster WG (Eds.) Linking Soil Fertility Management to Agricultural Input and Output Market Development: The Key to Sustainable Agriculture in West Africa. IFDC/IFA/DGIS, Lome – Togo.
- Honfoga BG (2007). Towards efficient private supply and distribution systems of fertilizer for sustainable agricultural intensification in Benin. PhD Thesis, CDS Studies No. 21. University of Groningen (<http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/304867942>).
- Hounkpodote R, Tossou C (2001). Profile of interactions between land issues and the development of urban agriculture, Final Report. Chamber of Agriculture of Benin and IAGU RFAU / COA. 73 p.
- Hounkponou KS (2003). Agriculture and urbanization: analysis of land pressure on gardening activities in southern Benin. Case Cotonou, Ouidah and Grand Popo, Thesis for graduation as Engineer in Agronomics Sciences, FSA / UAC, 103p.
- IITA (2002). Market survey for vegetables' bio-pesticides in Ghana and Benin: assessment of the competitiveness of vegetable production systems: case of cabbage and tomato, IITA-DFID, second output, October-November 2002, 14p.
- Kodjo M (2000). Socioeconomic Assessment of Agricultural production systems: a contribution to the identification of opportunities for sustainable development of the small farm. Case study in South Benin. PhD Thesis, University of Berlin, 249p.
- Koukponou C, Ofio CA, Loconon ZD (2010). Feasibility study for the installation of agricultural input shops in the departments of Mono and Couffo Final Report FAFA / CTB-Benin / APRM 108p.
- Kouvonou FM, Honfoga BG, Debrah SK (1999). Food security and integrated soil fertility management: the contribution of suburban market gardening in Lome, In: O. Smith (Ed.) Urban Agriculture in Africa, IDRC / CTA.
- Martin J (2007). The use of agricultural nets for natural ventilation in greenhouses: Impact on climate and ventilation. SLS-15505 courses, Soils Seminars, Laval University, Quebec, March 2007, 28p.
- Midingoyi GS (2003). Economic evaluation of intensification of rice production technologies: the case of shallow system in the villages of Gome and Gankpetin (communes Glazoue and Dassa-zoume in Benin Centre), Thesis for graduation as Engineer in Agronomics Sciences, FSA / UAC, 156 p.
- Monke EA & Pesaran SR (1989). The policy analysis matrix for agricultural development, Outreach Program, 196p.

Nijland GO, Schouls J, Goudriaan J (2008). Integrating the production functions of Liebig, Michaelis-Menten, Mitscherlich and Liebscher into one system dynamics model. *Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Sciences (NJAS)* 55-2, 2008.

Olanrewaju BS, Moustier PL, Mougeot Abdou F (2004). Sustainable development of urban agriculture in Francophone Africa. Issues, Concepts and methods. CIRAD / IDRC, 173 p.

PADAP / APRM (2003). Diagnosis, demand, supply and markets, production systems. Final report. Feasibility study. Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEP), Benin. 2. Volume 158 p

Reboul C (1976). Method of production and cropping systems and livestock. *Rural Economy* 112: 55-65.

Simeni Tchuinte, GM (2005). Socio-economic study of production systems gardening in urban and suburban areas of the city of Djougou (department of Donga), Thesis for graduation as Engineer in Agronomic Sciences, FSA / UAC, 141p.

Singbo A., Nouhoheflin T, Idrissou L (2004). Study of perceptions on pests vegetables in urban and suburban areas of southern Benin, Project Quality Vegetables, Activity Report, IITA-INRAB-OBEPAB, 21p.

Tiamiyou I (1995). Consultation mission in vegetable crop science from 30 July to 12 August 1995, Phase 1 Report, Current situation, FAO, 73p.

Tiamiyou I (2002). Technical notes on vegetables. FSA, University of Abomey-Calavi, 58p.

Tinker I (1998). Feeding Megacities: A Worldwide Viewpoint, Urban Age Winter.

Upton M (1996). The economy of tropical farming systems. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.

Villeneuve C (2014). Insect nets or how to keep insects off your vegetables. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; Sainte-Martine, Quebec, Canada.