

Nexus between Technical Efficiency and Financial Sustainability: Evidence from Small Scale Sunflower Oil Processing Firms in Tanzania.

Abstract

Studies on technical efficiency and financial sustainability of firms respectively, have captured the attention of many scholars in both developed and developing economies over several decades. There are patchy empirical evidences however, that link technical efficiency and financial sustainability of small scale agro-processing firms in the context of developing economies like Tanzania. Sunflower Oil Processing Firms are of no exception as the sub-sector is dominated by small scale firms with no well documented relationship between technical efficiency and their financial sustainability. This study was set to determine the relationship between technical efficiency and financial sustainability while controlling for staff productivity. The study used firm level cross-sectional data collected from 219 sunflower oil processing firms randomly selected in Dodoma and Singida regions. A Multiple Linear Regression Model was used in analysing the data. Technical efficiency scores were estimated using Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) model. It was found that there exists a relationship between technical efficiency and financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania. The higher the technical efficiency the more Sunflower Oil Processing Firms will be financially sustainable. The findings of this study imply that improving technical efficiency levels is a pre-requisite for financial sustainability of Sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania.

Key words: Technical Efficiency, Financial sustainability, Sunflower Oil Processing Firms

30 **1.0 Introduction**

31 Sunflower oil processing firms are ones of emerging agro-processing industries in Tanzania with
32 great potentials in providing nutritious and cholesterol free oil in both rural and urban areas,
33 apart from creating jobs and income (Ekblom, 2016). These industries are predominant in the
34 central agricultural corridor of Tanzania in Singida and Dodoma regions due to the large amount
35 of sunflower seeds being produced (TEOSA, 2012). Sunflower oil is the most important and
36 popular edible oil produced in Tanzania since colonial times when sunflower was introduced
37 from Europe and America (RLDC, 2010).

38
39 Despite the predominance of sunflower oil processing firms in the area where sunflower seeds
40 are largely grown, many of these firms are only of small scale (Ziliona, Mwatawala & Swai,
41 2013; Iringo, Elias & Majid, 2014). They produce low outputs whose standards are so low to
42 compete in international markets and hence end up operating at low profit (Mpeta, 2015). It has
43 been reported that, many agro-processing firms are established daily across the globe, but of
44 about 85% fail after only few months of operations since their establishment (Woldie, Leighton
45 & Adesua, 2008). This has been experienced even in developed countries like the USA, where
46 approximately 50% of small-scale food processing firms fail within the first year of operation
47 (Islam & Tedford, 2012). In China, many small processing firms have a lifespan of less than
48 three years (Yanping and Huanwei, 2006),. An even more discouraging situation has been
49 experienced in South Africa, where the rate of failure is much higher than others, in which,
50 between 70% and 80% of the firms fail within their first few months of operation (Fatoki, 2011).
51 One of the causes could be inefficiency in operations. This study was meant to determine the
52 relationship between technical efficiency and financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing
53 firms in Tanzania, the link which is scanty found in the literature.

54
55 The study has been grounded from the microfinance settings, particularly the study by
56 Nyamsogoro (2010); Kipesha (2013); Marwa and Aziakpono (2015) which established the
57 relationship between efficiency and financial sustainability in Microfinance empirical setting.
58 This was done following the absence of empirical evidences on the established link for
59 processing firms, particularly on the sunflower oil processing sub-sector in Tanzania context.

60

61 **2.0 Literature Review**

62 **2.1 The Concept of Financial Sustainability**

63 Theoretically, sustainability is a wide term and has been defined by many in several dimensions
64 depending on user requirements. For instance, Filene (2011) defined sustainability as the ability
65 of an entity to continue a defined behavior indefinitely. It further implies the ability of the firm to
66 meet its goals over the long term. In the same vein, Nyamsogoro (2010) in the Microfinance
67 sector defined sustainability to mean permanence or the ability to repeat performance through
68 time. Other scholars in a business sector like Hubbard (2009) described sustainability as the
69 ability of the firm to meet the need of its stakeholders without compromising its ability to meet
70 their needs in the future. In other words, financial sustainability means the smooth operation of
71 the firm with the necessary profitability, having adequate liquidity to overcome any challenges of
72 bankruptcy. It is also considered as a necessary condition for institutional sustainability which is
73 the most important requirement for any business. According to Doicui (2009) financial
74 sustainability is a full cost recovery or profit making and is associated with the aim of building
75 an institution that can last into the future without continual reliance on government subsidies or
76 donor funds. It is the ability of an institution to meet its operational costs from income generated
77 from services or products provided and have enough reserves for recapitalization (Thela, 2012).
78 In this paper, the financial sustainability refers to the ability of sunflower oil processing firm to
79 survive in the business and be able to meet its operational and financing expenses from its
80 income generated thus has enough profit for recapitalization in a long run. Specifically, it is the
81 ability of a sunflower oil processing firms to generate income that exceeds its total costs hence
82 survival in business for long time. Profitability is therefore considered as a residual and a proxy
83 measure of the firm financial sustainability.

84

85 **2.2 . Measures of Financial Sustainability**

86 Measurements of financial sustainability in previous literature have been encored in two levels
87 of indicators Operational Self-Sufficiency (OSS) and Financial Self-Ssufficiency (FSS)
88 (Nyamsogoro, 2010; Kipasha, 2013; Marwa & Aziakpono, 2015). Operational Self-Sufficiency
89 has been used to assess how far an institution has come in covering its operating expenses with
90 its operating income regardless of the source while financial self-sufficiency measures the extent
91 to which operating revenue can cover institution's direct and indirect costs from its income

92 generation (Thela, 2012). Moreover, Financial Self-Sufficiency is considered to be more
93 appropriate measure of sustainability as it attempts to show the financial picture of the firm on
94 unsubsidized basis (Nyamsogoro; 2010; Thela, 2012). It is defined as the ratio of adjusted
95 financial revenue to total expenses. The ratio above 1 indicates sustainability while below 1
96 indicates the incapability of the firm to pay all of their expenses from their own generated
97 income and therefore not financially sustainable

98
$$FSS = \frac{\text{Adjusted Financial Revenue}}{\text{Adjusted Operating Expenses}} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

99 In this paper, Financial Self- sufficiency (FSS) as a measure of the sunflower oil processing
100 firms' financial sustainability is a ratio of total expenses to total revenue. From the profitability
101 theory point of view profit is considered as the residual, calculated as an excess of income over
102 expenditure to mean financial sustainability (Glautier & Underdown, 2001; Nyamsogoro, 2010).
103 In other words, Marriott, Edwards and Mellett (2004) considered profits as what remain after
104 costs of productions have been paid for. If profit is considered as a residual, then profitability can
105 be used as a proxy measure of financial sustainability since it considers covering all costs
106 incurred in earning plus any costs necessary to at least maintain the current level of operations
107 (ibid).

108

109 **2.3 The Concept of Technical Efficiency**

110 Efficiency refers to reaching the desired output with the minimum input or means (Thela, 2012).
111 It is the relationship between inputs and output that seeks to minimize resources costs. The
112 conception of Technical efficiency is centred on input- output relationship. Technical efficiency
113 is achieved when a minimum possible input is used to produce a given level of output or when a
114 maximum possible output is produced given a certain level of input (Koopmans, 1951; Debreu;
115 1951) and (Farrell 1957; Kumbhakar & Lovell, 2000; Coelli et al. 2005; Charoenrat, 2012; and
116 Ngeh, 2014).

117 **2.4 . Measurement of Technical Efficiency**

118 Technical efficiency levels/scores estimated from each specific firm have been used as a proxy
119 measure of technical efficiency in sunflower oil processing firm as in previous studies
120 (Charoenrat, 2012, Ngeh, 2014, Marwa and Aziakpono, 2015). Each firm score was obtained as
121 continuous variable estimated by using the stochastic frontier model as the ratio of inputs to

122 outputs factors of production of the firm. This has been borrowed from the study by Njiku and
123 Nyamsogoro (2018), which simultaneously estimated and studied the determinants of technical
124 efficiency of small scale sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania using one stage stochastic
125 frontier Approach. Three inputs were involved in this relationship (capital, labour and material
126 costs) and unit processed in litres as output (Ibid). It is a measure of effectiveness transformation
127 of inputs into maximum outputs of the firms, which provides a more comprehensive measure of
128 effective use of the firms' resources in maximising their output. Optimal output of the firm
129 implies a high technical efficiency level attained and hence the financial sustainability of the firm
130 (Marwa & Aziakpono, 2015).

131

132 **2.5. Technical Efficiency and Financial Sustainability of the firm**

133 Financial sustainability of the firm has been considered by previous scholars as a function of
134 many different factors, both internal and external to firm operations depending on the research
135 question(s) addressed and data availability. For instance, the study by Nyamsogoro (2010) and
136 Thela (2012) respectively, analysed the relationship between efficiency and financial
137 sustainability in the area of Microfinance by looking at various cost and revenue elements like
138 liquidity ratio, operating expense ratio and staff productivity. They employed a traditional
139 approach (financial ratios) and found that efficiency helps microfinance institutions to attain their
140 financial sustainability. It is in this sense that efficiency of the firm reflects on whether existing
141 resources have been used effectively as it involves cost minimisation and income maximisation
142 at a given level of operation thus have an enduring impact on the financial sustainability of the
143 firm (Essmui, Berma, Shahadan & Ramlee, 2013; Ngeh, 2014).

144

145 To add on that, the study by Marwa and Aziakpono (2015) used return on assets, technical
146 efficiency levels /scores, loan size and deposit mobilization and cost per loan portfolio as
147 explanatory variables in predicting financial sustainability of SACCOs in Tanzania. It has been
148 reported that, efficiency is positively related to financial sustainability of the firm (Nyamsogoro,
149 2010). More efficient firms tend to have relatively lower expenditure and higher revenue
150 generated per unit. This is to say that efficiency of the firm affects the financial sustainability
151 either through cost reduction or revenue increase or both (ibid).

152

153 Though these studies provide a good background to the study at hand, they differ in terms of
154 their nature of inputs and outputs thus their findings cannot be generalised across sectors and
155 sub-sectors due to different contexts. The Microfinance Institutions deal with the provision of
156 small-scale financial services to business firms and individuals while agro-processing firms,
157 particularly sunflower oil processing firms deal with the extraction of oil and seedcakes from
158 sunflower seeds.

159 **2.5.1. Technical Efficiency Levels/scores**

160 In this paper, technical efficiency was used as a measure of the effectiveness of transformation of
161 a set of inputs resources given and technology into maximum outputs. It was computed from
162 capital, labour and material costs as inputs originally measured in Tanzania Shillings (Tshs) as
163 well as unit processed in liters as output but were all transformed into their natural logs. Each
164 firm specific scores were computed as continuous variables for inclusion in the regression
165 analysis.

166 **2.5.2. Staff Productivity Ratio**

167 Efficiency also depends on staff productivity. The staff productivity ratio captures the overall
168 productivity of the firms' total human resources in maximizing out for improved financial
169 sustainability. It is the ratio of the number of units produced by the number of staff involved. The
170 ratio provides information on how efficiently the firm uses its personnel resources in maximizing
171 their output. In the same vein, the ratio indicates how well the firm utilizes its staff in general in
172 enhancing income and reducing the overall expenditure. It indicates how efficiently the firm is
173 using its resources and the role played by the staff in managing its production, bringing about
174 profitability and hence the financial sustainability of the firm. Studies in Microfinance
175 Institutions revealed that the higher the number of units per staff would indicate the "firm's"
176 high efficiency in utilizing its staff and hence high profitability of the firm for financial
177 sustainability (Nyamsogoro, 2010; Thela 2012). This study used staff productivity to test the
178 applicability of this finding in sunflower oil processing firms' empirical settings.

179
180

181 **3.0. Methodology**

182 This study combines both technical efficiency scores estimated from a Stochastic Frontier
183 Analysis (SFA) model as the ratio of each firms 'inputs and output, which formed a column of

184 continuous variable and staff productivity ratio from the traditional ratio approach as a measure
185 of efficiency in explaining the financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms. The
186 inclusion of staff productivity ratio in the regression model was to determine the extent to which
187 sunflower oil processing firms utilize their staff in maximizing their output for improved
188 financial sustainability. This was done in an attempt to control for staff productivity differences,
189 so that we could ensure the internal validity of the influence of technical efficiency levels on the
190 financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania. This has been grounded
191 following the assertion by Kuhn (1996) as quoted in Nyamsogoro (2010:61) that “*devising new*
192 *approaches and methodologies may lead to the discovery of new knowledge*”.

193

194 **3. 1. The Data**

195 A set of primary cross-sectional firm-level data was collected from for 219 sunflower oil
196 processing firms in Dodoma and Singida regions using both questionnaires and interviews.
197 Dodoma and Singida regions were purposely selected as central agricultural corridor and processing
198 potential of sunflower oil in Tanzania. The highest produced amount of sunflower seeds in this area
199 has led to predominance of sunflower oil processing industries along Dar-es salaam to lake zones
200 and Arusha highways.

201

202 The study used simple random sampling technique in selecting sunflower oil processing firms in
203 the area where only firm owners were purposively selected as targeted respondents. This was due
204 to the fact that sunflower oil processing firms are of small- scale in nature mainly owned and
205 controlled by the individuals. The owners of the firms were purposely selected and interviewed
206 as primary sources on important data particularly on the quantity produced on liters, price per
207 liter, quantity of raw materials used and the price per bag, average daily wages for labour, other
208 operating expenses incurred daily and the number of personnel in their respective firms.

209

210 **3.2. Model Specification**

211 Multiple Linear Regression Model was used to determine the influence of technical efficiency on
212 the financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms. The model suits in this study due to

213 the nature of the dependent variable (Financial Sustainability) which was continuous and
214 involved more than one explanatory variable in explaining the relationship.

215

216 **3.2.1 Dependent Variable**

217 Financial Sustainability was measured by Financial Self-Sufficiency (FSS) as the ratio of
218 revenue to expenses for each specific sunflower oil processing firm under the study. The use of
219 Financial Self-Sufficiency (FSS) as the proxy measure of financial sustainability in sunflower oil
220 processing firms was due to the fact that, it measures the ability of the firm to cover its operating
221 expenses from the income generated internally. Financial Self Sufficiency indicates the ability of
222 the firm to sustain itself in the business from its generated income. The ratio is computed as: FSS
223 = Total Revenue /Operating expenses.

224

225 The revenue was computed by considering the number of litres processed and sold in each
226 sunflower oil processing firm and the price per litre in a year. Also, all expenses incurred by the
227 firm for getting the revenue including material costs, labour costs, water and electricity costs,
228 rent and taxes were considered in computing the FSS.

229

230 **3.2.2 Independent Variables**

231 Independent variables were technical efficiency and staff productivity. The technical efficiency
232 was measured by technical efficiency levels/scores. Staff productivity was introduced to control
233 for differences in staff productivity which could influence sustainability apart from technical
234 efficiency. Both variables, technical efficiency levels and staff productivity ratio were estimated
235 from each specific firm as continuous to measure the role of efficiency in explaining the
236 financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms as in previous studies (Njiku &
237 Nyamsogoro, 2018).

238

239 Dependent and independent variables involved were continuous and thus suit for Multiple Linear
240 Regression Analysis (MLRA) model in studying the relationship, as expressed in the general
241 linear regression operational equation below.

242

243 **3.2.2. The Operational Model**

244
 245
$$E(Y)_i = \alpha + \beta_i X_i + \dots + \beta_n X_n \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

246 Where, $E(Y)_i$ is the mean of the response variable which was Financial Self-Sufficiency (FSS) in
 247 this case, X_i are independent variables involved in the study, which are technical efficiency
 248 levels and staff productivity ratio from each specific firm, and β_i are their respective parameters.

249
 250 **3.3 Operationalization of the study variables and their expected effects on**
 251 **Financial Sustainability.**

252 Measurements of variables involved in the study and their expected theoretical effect on the
 253 dependent variable are indicated in Table 1.

254
 255 **Table 1: Operationalization of the study variables**

S/N	Technical Efficiency Indicators.	Definition and measurement	Expected effect on FSS	Comments
1	Technical Efficiency levels	A continuous variable estimated from SFA as a ratio of output to input factors of production for each firm.	+	Maximum output increases the profit and hence financial sustainability of the firm.
2	Staff Productivity Ratio	Continuous variable, measured as the ratio of unit produced per staff.	+	More units produced per staff means efficiency utilisation of staff for higher profitability.
3	Financial Self Sufficient (FSS)	Continuous variable and a measure of financial sustainability as the ratio of Revenue/Expenses.	(dependent variable)	Ratio >1 means Financially sustainable Ratio <1 means not financially sustainable.

256
 257

258 **4.0 Results**

259 **4.1: Descriptive Results**

260 The descriptive statistics explaining the overall distribution of the variables included in the
 261 model as is indicated in Table 2

262
 263 **Table 2: Descriptive Statistics**

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Financial Self Sufficiency	0.942	0.155	219
Technical Efficiency levels	0.529	0.149	219
Staff Productivity ratio	9700.278	10631.365	219

264
 265 The results in Table 2 indicate that on average, sunflower oil processing firms under the study
 266 are not financially self-sufficient as their overall ratio is below 1 (0.94). This implies that most of
 267 sunflower oil processing firms are not able to cover their operating expense from internally
 268 generated income, though they are nearly break-evening, to mean that they are just retaining their
 269 operating capital. Thus any improvement on the significant variables would mean profitability
 270 and hence financial sustainability of the firms. Likewise, the results in Table 2 depicts that on
 271 average sunflower oil processing firms operate at a mean technical efficiency level of 53%
 272 implying that there is an opportunity for more improvement by 47% under a better use of inputs
 273 and technology. Besides, the descriptive results also revealed that each staff can produce 9700
 274 units of output on average for maximum profit. However, standard deviation on both financial
 275 self-sufficiency and on technical efficiency scores was of about 15.5% and 14.9% respectively
 276 indicating that there is variability in the performance among sunflower oil processing firms.
 277 There are huge variability on staff productivity among firms under study as indicated by the
 278 standard deviation.

279
 280 The analysis in Table 2 of descriptive statistics was extended in Table 3 to disclose the
 281 distribution of firms under the study according to their Financial self-sufficiency performance
 282 ratio as either they are not financially sustainable (operate at loss), operate at a break-even point or
 283 at a profit to imply they are financial sustainability as indicated in Table 3.

284 **Table 3: Distribution of firms according to FSS performance ratio**

FSS ratio	n	%
Below 1	118	53.8
1	10	4.6
Above 1	91	41.6
Total	219	100.0

285
 286 The results in Table 3 indicate that 53.8 % (n=118) of sunflower oil processing firms under the
 287 study operate at a loss since their ratio is below 1. This implies that expenses of the firms are
 288 higher than revenue generated and thus the firms are unable to cover their operating expenses
 289 from their income generated and therefore could be financially unsustainable. Also 4.6% (n =10)
 290 of the firms under the study are operating at the break-even point since their FSS ratio is 1
 291 indicating that the revenue generated is equal to expenses incurred and thus the firms are neither

292 making profit nor loss. Their generated revenue is enough to cover expenses without any surplus,
 293 thus are retaining their operating capital. Moreover 41.6% (n = 91) of sunflower oil processing
 294 firms under the study are operating at a profit since their FSS ratio is above 1 indicating that the
 295 firm's revenue are higher than expenses incurred and thus could be financially sustainable.

296 4.2. Empirical Results

297 This paper aimed to determine the influence of technical efficiency on financial sustainability of
 298 sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania, using a combined measure of efficiency (technical
 299 efficiency levels and staff productivity, the contribution which is scantily found in previous
 300 studies. This paper therefore fills this knowledge gap by using Multiple Linear Regression as
 301 indicated in Table 4 of model summary.

302

303 **Table 4: Model Summary^b**

304

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.871 ^a	.758	.756	.07675	1.826

306

312 a. Predictors: (Constant), Staff Productivity ratio, Technical Efficiency (TE) levels

313 b. Dependent Variable: Financial Self- Sufficiency (FSS)

314

315 The results of the overall linear regression model summary indicate R² value of 0.758 to imply
 316 that 75.8% of the variation in the dependent variable (FSS) was explained by the independent
 317 variables included in the model. Also, the regression coefficients Table 5 indicate the joint and
 318 individual effect of the technical efficiency levels and staff productivity ratio (independent
 319 variables) to the financial sustainability (dependent variable) of sunflower oil processing firms
 320 in Tanzania, respectively.

321

322 **Table 5: Regression Coefficients of Technical efficiency level and staff productivity to FSS**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standard. Coeff.	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.417	.022		18.657	.000**		
TE levels	1.048						
Staff Prod. Ratio	-3.108E-006	.049	1.006	21.478	.000**	.509	1.963
		.000	-.213	-4.537	.000**	.509	1.963

323

**Significant at 5%

324
325 The results in Table 5 revealed that both technical efficiency levels and staff productivity ratios,
326 jointly predict the financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania due to a
327 significant F-statistic. Both variables are highly statistically significant determinants of the
328 financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania at 5% level of significance
329 with ($p = 0.0001$) though with different directions. Technical efficiency level relates positively
330 to the financial sustainability of the firm while staff productivity ratio relates negatively to the
331 financial sustainability of the firms under the study.

332
333 The positive coefficients for technical efficiency levels with financial sustainability implies that
334 when technical efficiency level of the firm increases the financial sustainability of sunflower oil
335 processing firms also increases. Thus, the higher the technical efficiency levels the better
336 indication for high financial sustainability of the firms. This further means that input resources
337 transformed to the optimal output in terms of quantity of oil in litres produced and sold lead to
338 high revenue and hence the financial sustainability of the firm.

339
340 However, a negative beta coefficient of staff productivity with the financial sustainability of the
341 firms under the study implies that any increase in a number of units produces per staff affect
342 negatively the financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania.
343 Theoretically, it would be expected that high staff productivity ratio would lead to efficient
344 utilisation in maximising output and hence a high level of financial sustainability, but the
345 empirical evidence suggests otherwise. The negative relationship between staff productivity and
346 financial sustainability in this study implies that the more numbers of units produced by a staff
347 the less financially sustainable the firm is. This implies a prevalent state where there is a big
348 difference between units produced as a result of staff productivity and units actually sold as a
349 result of market response. Moreover, sunflower oil processing firms are basically machine
350 intensive and not labour intensive. This is due to the fact that the main driver and catalyst of the
351 production in sunflower oil processing firms are machines (technology) and not human capital
352 (staff) as compared to other sub-sectors of manufacturing. This was also revealed by high
353 elasticity of capital input (measured by cost of machines) as it relates positively to the output of
354 the firms measured in litres of oil processed (Njiku & Nyamsogoro, 2018).

355

356 Moreover, technical efficiency levels were computed from the input-output relationship of
357 capital, labour and material to the (quantity) litres of oil processed as output. In this capital and
358 materials contribute significantly to the output, though with different directions, positively with
359 capital while negatively related to materials of production. The negative relation with material
360 implies that the output of the firm declines with an increase in materials. This is due to the low
361 quality of raw materials used in the production, purchased during harvest season without quality
362 compromise to avoid shortage during off- season due to the seasonality nature of the sunflower
363 seeds. The seeds are not available to processors throughout the year and if available, are sold
364 through the middlemen at high cost regardless of their quality. Capital comprised of the initial
365 cost of processing machines which are available to all firms, thus contributed positively with
366 high elasticity to imply that, it is the most contributing input factor of production to sunflower oil
367 processing firms' production capacity (Njiku & Nyamsogoro, 2018). The findings are in line
368 with the study by Essmui et al. (2013) and Ngeh (2014) respectively, which also found that
369 technical efficiency influence the financial sustainability of the manufacturing firms. A negative
370 relationship between staff productivity and financial sustainability of the firms was also observed
371 in the study by Nyamsogoro (2010) on the financial sustainability of Rural Microfinance in
372 Tanzania.

373
374 Therefore, by using a combined measure of efficiency as determinants of financial sustainability
375 of sunflower oil processing firm, it was observed that technical efficiency levels from a
376 transformed set of inputs, particularly capital and materials under a given technology matters a
377 lot in explaining the financial sustainability of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania. Also,
378 though staff utilization efficiency is negatively related to the financial sustainability of the firm,
379 their role should not be ignored completely. Firms need to put up strategies to ensure that there is
380 sufficient market for output produced at profit marking prices.

381

382

383 **5.0 Conclusion and Policy Implications.**

384 Based on empirical findings, we conclude that technical efficiency and financial sustainability of
385 small scale sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania are positively related. A strong and highly
386 statistically significant relationship revealed between technical efficiency levels and the financial

387 sustainability of firms mean that technical efficiency matters a lot for the financial sustainability
388 of sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania. Any increase in the technical efficiency level in
389 sunflower oil processing firms, increases the profitability of the firm and hence financial
390 sustainability. Moreover, the role of human capital (staff) in sunflower oil processing firms,
391 particularly in handily support to processing machines and in packaging of oil is important for
392 improved financial sustainability. These findings imply the need for government and other
393 agencies in the sector to create an enabling environment for sunflower oil processing firms to
394 have access to improved machines (technology) and quality materials for enhanced technical
395 efficiency and reliable markets. These are prerequisites for financial sustainability of small scale
396 sunflower oil processing firms in Tanzania.

397

398

399 **References**

- 400 Charoenrat, T. (2012). The Technical Efficiency of Thai Manufacturing Small and Medium
401 Enterprises: A Comparison between pre- and post-financial of 1997. PhD Thesis,
402 University of Wollongong.
- 403 Coelli, T. J., Rao, D. S. P., O'Donnell, C. J. & Battese, G. E. (2005). An Introduction to Efficiency and
404 Productivity Analysis 2. Springer, New York, USA.
- 405 Collier, P. M (2006). Accounting for Managers: Interpreting Accounting Information for
406 Decision Making. 2nd Edition. England: John Wiley and Son Ltd.
- 407 Debru, G. (1951). The Coefficient of Resource Utilisation. *Econometrica*, 19(3), 273-292.
408 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1906814>.
- 409 Doicui, M. (2009). The Microfinance Operations Sustainability's triple bottom line
410 Characteristics in Eastern Europe. A case study on the Romanian Microfinance Sector
- 411 Ekblom, M. (2016). *Challenges Facing Food processing MSEs in Tanzania: Qualitative Case*
412 *Study of the Sunflower Oil Industry in Babati, Manyara*. Doctoral dissertation, Södertörn
413 University.
- 414 Essmui, H., Berma, M., Shahadan, F., & Ramlee, S. (2013). Technical Efficiency of
415 Manufacturing Enterprises in Libya: A Stochastic Frontier Analysis. *International*
416 *Journal of Management & Information Technology*, 5(2), 528-535.

417 Fatoki, O.O. (2011).The Impact of Human, Social and Financial Capital on the Performance of
418 Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in South Africa. *Journal of Social Sciences*
419 9(3), 193-204.

420 Farrell, M. J. (1957). The Measurement of Productive Efficiency. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
421 *Society, 120(3), 253-290.*

422 Filene, (2011), “Credit Union Financial Sustainability: A Colloquium at Harvard University”,
423 Filene Research Institute Report Number 231.

424 Glautier, M. W. E. & Underdown, B. (2001). Accounting theory and Practice, 7th Edition.
425 United Kingdom: FT Prentice-Hall

426 Hubbard, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: beyond the triple bottom line.
427 *Business strategy and the environment, 18(3), 177-191.*

428 Iringo, R., Elias, P. & Majid, S. (2014). Processors Study Report in Tanzania. 40 pp.

429 Islam, A., & Tedford, D. (2012). Risk determinants of small and medium-sized manufacturing
430 enterprises (SMEs) - an exploratory study in New Zealand. *Journal of Industrial*
431 *Engineering International, 8 (12), 1-13.*

432 Kipsha. E.F. (2013). Sustainability, Profitability and Outreach Tradeoffs. Evidence from
433 Microfinance Institutions in East Africa. *European Journal of Business and*
434 *Management, 5(8).*

435 Koopmans, T. C. (1951). *An Analysis of Production as Efficient Combination of Activities.* In
436 T. C. Koopmans (ed.) Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation. New York:
437 Cowles Commission for Research in Economics. (Monograph No. 13.)

438 Kuhn, T.S. (1996). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 3rd Edition, Chicago. Chicago
439 University Press.

440 Kumbhakar, S.C. and Lovell, C.K. (2000). Stochastic production frontier. Cambridge:
441 Cambridge University Press.

442 Liu, D., Liao, C.S. & Yang, C.H. (2010). Efficiency, Productivity and Ownership Structure for
443 Securities Firms in Taiwan. *Journal of Money, Investment and Banking, 14, 46-58.*

444 Marwa, N. & Aziakpono, M. (2015). *Financial Sustainability of Tanzanian Saving and Credit*
445 *Cooperatives.* Economic Research Southern Africa (ERSA) Working Paper 529.

446 Marriott, R. Edwards, J. R. & Mellett, H. J. (2004). Introduction to Accounting, 3rd Edition
447 London: Sage Publication Limited

448 Mpeti, D.F. (2015). *Effects of Contract Farming on production and Income of Sunflower*
449 *Farmers in Kongwa District in Central Agricultural Zone of Tanzania. PhD Thesis,*
450 *Mzumbe University, Morogoro, Tanzania.*

451 Nyamsogoro, D.G (2010). *Financial Sustainability of Rural Microfinance in Tanzania.* PhD
452 *Thesis, University of Greenwich, UK.*

453 Ngeh, E.T. (2014). *Technical Efficiency and Manufacturing Export Performance in Cameroon.*
454 *PhD Dissertation, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania*

455 Njiku, A. R. & Nyamsogoro, G. D. (2018). Determinants of Technical Efficiency of Small Scale
456 *Sunflower Oil Processing Firms in Tanzania. Asian Journal of Economics and Empirical*
457 *Research, Vol. 5, Issue No. 1, pp.79 –86.*

458 RLDC| Rural Livelihood Development Company (2008). Sunflower Sector; Market Development
459 *Strategy, an initiative by Rural Livelihood Development Company. [Online]:*
460 *<http://www.rldc.co.tz/docs/sunflower.pdf>.*

461 Tanzania Edible Oils Actors Association[TEOSA],(2012). *Assessment of the potential of edible*
462 *oilseeds produced in Tanzania: The case of sunflower and sesame.* Research Document
463 *No.1, October, 2012.*

464 Thela, T. (2012).*The efficiency and sustainability of Microfinance Institutions in South-Africa.*
465 *Masters Dissertation, University of Johannesburg, South Africa.*

466 Woldie A., Leighton, P. & Adesua, A. (2008). *Factors influencing Small and Medium*
467 *Enterprises (SMEs).* An Exploratory study of owner/manager and firm characteristics:
468 *Bank and Bank systems Vol.3 (3).*

469 Yanping, L & Huanwei, W. (2006). *A Study on Effects of Social Networks on Human Resource*
470 *Management in Small and Medium Business.* Retrieved on August 17, 2013, from
471 www.academia.edu/2443357/

472 Zilion, I. J. E., Mwatawala, H. W. & Swai, E. Y. (2013). Sunflower Production and
473 *its Contribution to Poverty Reduction in Singida District, Tanzania. Presented at REPO's*
474 *18th Annual Research Workshop held at the Kunduchi Beach Hotel, Dar es Salaam,*
475 *Tanzania; April 3-4, 2013. 70pp.*