

Selcuk Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences

http://sjafs.selcuk.edu.tr/sjafs/index

Research Article

SJAFS

(2020) 34 (1), 7-13 e-ISSN: 2458-8377

DOI:10.15316/SJAFS.2020.188

Economic Analysis for Groundwater-Irrigated Oil Sunflower Farming in Konya Region

Ramazan CERAN¹, Ramazan TOPAK^{1,*}

¹Selçuk University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Irrigation, Konya, Turkey.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received date: 22.10.2019 Accepted date: 06.12.2019

Edited by:

Duran YAVUZ; Selçuk University, Turkey

Reviewed by:

Sinan SÜHERİ; Selçuk University, Turkey Fatih KIZILOĞLU; Atatürk University, Turkey

Keywords:

Oil sunflower groundwater irrigation economic analysis Konya

ABSTRACT

In this study, economic analysis was conducted for groundwater-irrigated oil sunflower farming in Konya region. This study was conducted over the agricultural fields of 20 oil sunflower farmers operating within the irrigation scheme of groundwater irrigation cooperative of Başgötüren districts of Karatay town of Konya province in 2019. Within the scope of this study, inputs used in oil sunflower farming, input quantities and unit prices, yields and unit sales prices of the farmers were determined. Cost-benefit analysis was performed with the resultant data and economic assessments were performed for irrigated oil sunflower farming. Average total production cost of groundwater-irrigated oil sunflower farming was calculated as 4683.4 TL ha⁻¹ (821.6 \$ ha⁻¹). Of such a cost, 50% was constituted by irrigation costs. Electricity constituted the greatest cost item in irrigation costs. Average gross production value was calculated as 8208.3 TL ha⁻¹ (1440.1 \$ ha⁻¹). Together with state supports, average net income was calculated as 5057.3 TL ha⁻¹ (887.2 \$ ha⁻¹).

1. Introduction

Sunflower is an annual herbaceous plant which has been produced for oil since the beginning of the 18th century. It is among the most important oil crops worldwide. Sunflower is originated from the Central America. Annual oil sunflower production of the world was 26 533 596 ha in 2017. Russia and Ukraine are the leading sunflower producer countries of the world. Among the first 10 countries with the greatest sunflower production lands. Turkey has the 7th place (FAO-STAT, 2019). Turkey is also among the important sunflower producer countries. In Turkey, oil sunflower was cultivated over 648 934 ha land area in 2018. However, only 26.1% of these production lands are under irrigation (TÜİK, 2019). In this sense, Konya province has an important share in sunflower production of Turkey. According to TÜİK data, in 2018, 11.3% of sunflower production and about 16% of oil sunflower production of Turkey was practiced in Konya province. Sunflower farming is generally practiced under irrigated conditions in Konya region and the

province alone constitute about 43% of total irrigated sunflower farming lands of Turkey. In Konya region, irrigation is the most significant input in sunflower and other crops farming, and a large ratio of crop water consumption was compensated by irrigation water because of low rainfall. The compensation rate of ET by applied irrigation was determined as at sugarbeet 88% (Topak et al., 2016), at sunflower 80% (Yavuz et al., 2016; Yavuz et al., 2018) and at confectionary pumpkin 82% (Yavuz et al., 2015) for full irrigation conditions. Groundwater-based irrigation operations use quite much energy and thus constitute a significant cost item in agricultural practices. Groundwater resources are used in majority of irrigated lands in Konya region (Topak et al., 2008).

Previous researchers conducted experimental studies for economic analysis of sunflower farming (Das and Rout, 2018; Karaağaç et al., 2018; Sethar et al., 2015; Unakıtan and Aydın, 2018; Semerci et al., 2007). For instance, Sethar et al. (2015) conducted a survey study in Pakistan for economic analysis of oil sunflower farming and indicated total production cost as 481.4 \$ ha⁻¹, gross income as 797 \$ ha⁻¹ and net income as 315 \$ ha⁻¹. Das and Rout (2018) conducted an economic analysis of oil sunflower farming in India and reported total production costs as 564 \$ ha⁻¹ and net in-

^{*} Corresponding author email: : rtopak@selcuk.edu.tr

^{*} This manuscript was derived from Master's Thesis of Ramazan CERAN

come as 584 \$ ha⁻¹. Unakıtan and Aydın (2018) conducted an economic analysis of oil sunflower farming in Thrace region of Turkey and indicated net income as 26 \$ ha⁻¹. Karaağaç et al. (2018) conducted a study under provincial conditions of Adana, Turkey and indicated production cost of oil sunflower farming as 3454.7 TL ha⁻¹, gross income as 5040 TL ha⁻¹ and net income as 1585.3 TL ha⁻¹.

In this study, economic analysis was conducted for oil sunflower farming practiced under Konya conditions and produced with groundwater irrigations. In this sense, cost-benefit analysis method was used to determine some economic indicators.

2. Material and Method

This study was conducted over the agricultural fields of 20 oil sunflower farmers operating within the irrigation scheme of groundwater irrigation cooperative of Başgötüren districts of Karatay town of Konya

Table 1
Temperature and precipitation data for the research site (MBM, 2019)

| Cail analyses manualed that annumber and a sile annumber |
|---|
| Soil analyses revealed that experimental soils were |
| clay-loam in texture with high lime contents. All of the |
| oil sunflower farmers selected in this study were using |
| groundwater in irrigations. Drip and sprinkler irrigation |
| methods are used in irrigations. The research site has a |
| dominant terrestrial climate. Some meteorological data |
| for the research site are provided in Table 1. Climate |
| data were supplied from the nearest climate station |
| located at Esentepe district (Karatay town). Long term |
| average precipitation for sunflower growing season |

(March – October) is 124.2 mm and the amount

realized in the research year was 134.3 mm.

province in 2019. Basgörüren irrigation cooperative

was put into operation in 1978. The cooperative has

actively operating 43 wells and total irrigation water

discharge is 4 536 m³ h⁻¹. Total land size opened for

irrigation is 1847 ha and pressurized irrigation is

practiced over the irrigated lands of the cooperative

(KBSKB, 2017). Discharge of operating wells varies

between 54 m³ h⁻¹ and 144 m³ h⁻¹.

| | | | Months | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Annual Average |
| Long-term averages | Temperature (⁰ C) | -0.2 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 15.8 | 20.1 | 23.5 | 23.2 | 18.5 | 12.5 | 6.3 | 1.7 | 11.6 |
| | Precipitation (mm) | 37.6 | 28.5 | 28.9 | 31.9 | 43.6 | 25.5 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 12.3 | 30.0 | 32.0 | 42.1 | 323.3 |
| 2019 | Precipitation (mm) | 17.1 | 41.3 | 14.7 | 26.2 | 17.1 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 6.6 | - | - | - | 207.4 |

Within the scope of field works, 20 oil sunflower farmers practicing under groundwater irrigation cooperative were selected randomly. During the growing season of 2019, farmer's practices and required inputs, input quantities and monetary values, products and product unit prices were determined through regular monitoring and face-to-face meetings with the farmers. Within the scope of such works, farmer-scale data were gathered about the basic production inputs such as seed, fertilizer, machine, diesel fuel, electricity for irrigation and irrigation system. Machine and equipment economic lives were taken from ASAE (1999) and economic life values of pressurized irrigation system were considered as farmer's opinion. Product price of oil sunflower varies based on oil content. The criteria considered for product unit prices are provided in Table 2.

Table 2 Sunflower purchase prices (Konya Sugar Co., 2019)

| Oil ratio (%) | Price (TL kg ⁻¹) |
|---------------|------------------------------|
| 52 | 2.965 |
| 51 | 2.927 |
| 50 | 2.890 |
| 49 | 2.852 |
| 48 | 2.815 |
| 47 | 2.777 |
| 46 | 2.740 |
| 45 | 2.702 |
| 44 | 2.665 |

Cost-benefit analysis (Layard and Glaister, 1994; Ballestero, 2000) method was used to calculate economic indices in irrigated sunflower farming. In this sense, initially total production costs (irrigation + other costs) and gross income per unit area (ha) were calculated. Then, these values were used to determine some economic assessment indicators. Equations used in such calculations are provided below:

- Irrigation cost (A) (TL ha^{-1}) = Irrigation system cost + energy cost + irrigation labor cost
- The other costs (B) (TL ha⁻¹) = Soil tillage + seedbed preparation + seeding + seed + fertilizer and fertilization + hoeing + chemicals and applications + harvest
- Total production costs (C) (TL ha^{-1}) = A + B
- Contribution of irrigation to total production costs $(\%) = A /(A + B) \times 100$
- Gross production value (D) (TL ha⁻¹) = Yield (kg ha⁻¹) × sales price (TL kg⁻¹)
- Net income (TL ha⁻¹) = D C (Ballestero, 2000)
- Economic productivity (EP) (kg TL^{-1}) = Yield (kg ha⁻¹)/C (TL ha⁻¹)
- Economic irrigation water productivity (EIWP) (TL m⁻³) = Net income (TL) / amount of applied irrigation water (m³) (Pereira et al., 2012; Çetin and Kara, 2019)
- Breakeven point (kg ha⁻¹) = (C)/Sales price (TL kg⁻¹) (Layard and Glaister, 1994; García-García et al., 2004).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Irrigation and yield values

Seasonal amount of irrigation water applied to sunflower was determined and provided in Table 3. Amount of applied irrigation water varied from one farmer to another. The lowest amount of applied irrigation water was 2304 $\rm m^3~ha^{-1}$ and the greatest value was 6352 $\rm m^3~ha^{-1}$ and average of research sites was calculated as 4004 $\rm m^3~ha^{-1}$. There were differences in yields

Amount of applied irrigation water and yields of farmers

of farmers as provided in Table 3. Yields of participant farmers varied between 2200 - 4000 kg ha⁻¹ with an average value of 3256 kg ha⁻¹. As can be inferred from the table, the greatest yields were not obtained by the farmers applying the greatest amount of irrigation water and vice versa. A two-year field experiment conducted by Yavuz et al. (2019) in the same region, reported that seed yield for oil sunflower irrigated at different irrigation levels was between 3243 (3412 m³ ha⁻¹) and 5445 kg ha⁻¹ (6900 m³ ha⁻¹) and, the maximum yield was achived at full irrigation condition.

| Farmers | Field size (ha) | Well dis- charge (m³ h²¹) | Irrigation duration (h) | Amount of applied irrigation water (m ³ ha ⁻¹) | Yield (kg ha ⁻¹) | Number of irrigations | Irrigation method |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | 4.75 | 144 | 133 | 4032.00 | 3728 | 4 | SI |
| 2 | 3.00 | 144 | 132 | 6336.00 | 2660 | 4 | SI |
| 3 | 5.25 | 72 | 208 | 2852.57 | 3000 | 4 | SI |
| 4 | 10.00 | 108 | 260 | 2808.00 | 2200 | 3 | SI |
| 5 | 10.00 | 54 | 1040 | 5616.00 | 2600 | 4 | SI |
| 6 | 5.00 | 144 | 80 | 2304.00 | 3680 | 6 | DI |
| 7 | 2.50 | 108 | 96 | 4147.20 | 3600 | 4 | SI |
| 8 | 2.35 | 144 | 63 | 3860.43 | 3770 | 5 | SI |
| 9 | 7.50 | 108 | 357 | 5140.80 | 3600 | 4 | DI |
| 10 | 3.00 | 108 | 95 | 3420.00 | 3480 | 4 | SI |
| 11 | 7.50 | 108 | 209 | 3009.60 | 2800 | 4 | SI |
| 12 | 2.30 | 108 | 88 | 4132.17 | 2200 | 4 | SI |
| 13 | 5.00 | 90 | 165 | 2970.00 | 3800 | 5 | SI |
| 14 | 6.90 | 144 | 220 | 4591.30 | 4000 | 4 | DI |
| 15 | 3.25 | 108 | 75 | 2492.31 | 3000 | 3 | SI |
| 16 | 1.70 | 90 | 120 | 6352.94 | 2400 | 4 | SI |
| 17 | 6.25 | 108 | 258 | 4458.24 | 3800 | 6 | DI |
| 18 | 7.50 | 144 | 168 | 3225.60 | 3400 | 4 | SI |
| 19 | 6.00 | 144 | 200 | 4800.00 | 3400 | 4 | DI |
| 20 | 4.75 | 108 | 156 | 3546.95 | 4000 | 6 | DI |
| Avrg. | 5.23 | 114 | 206 | 4004.81 | 3256 | | |

SI: Sprinkler irrigation; DI: Drip irrigation

3.2. Economic analysis

3.2.1. Irrigation costs

Irrigation costs of each farmer were calculated for oil sunflower cultivation with groundwater irrigations and resultant values are provided in Table 4. The lowest cost of irrigation was calculated as 1207.7 TL ha⁻¹

Table 4
Irrigation costs of oil sunflower cultivation

 $(211.9 \ ha^{-1})$ and the greatest value was calculated as 4404 TL ha^{-1} (772.6 $\ ha^{-1}$) and average of the research site was calculated as 2383 TL ha^{-1} (418 $\ ha^{-1}$).

| Farmers | Land size (ha) | Hourly price of well (TL h ⁻¹) | Total operation duration of well (h) | Electricity cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Irrigation system cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Labor cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Total irrigation cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Total irrigation cost (\$ ha ⁻¹) | Ratio of electricity cost to irrigation costs (%) |
|---------|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | 4.75 | 64 | 133 | 1792 | 50 | 0 | 1842.0 | 323.2 | 97 |
| 2 | 3.00 | 64 | 132 | 2816 | 60 | 400 | 3276.0 | 574.7 | 86 |
| 3 | 5.25 | 32 | 208 | 1268 | 38 | 0 | 1305.8 | 229.1 | 97 |
| 4 | 10.00 | 48 | 260 | 1248 | 69 | 1000 | 2317.0 | 406.5 | 54 |
| 5 | 10.00 | 24 | 1040 | 2496 | 55 | 0 | 2551.0 | 447.5 | 98 |

Table 4 (Continuation)
Irrigation costs of oil sunflower cultivation

| migation | i costs or o | on summo we | 1 Cultivation | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| 6 | 5.00 | 64 | 80 | 992 | 680 | 0 | 1672.0 | 293.3 | 59 |
| 7 | 2.50 | 48 | 96 | 1843 | 220 | 0 | 2063.2 | 362.0 | 89 |
| 8 | 2.35 | 64 | 63 | 1716 | 247 | 480 | 2442.7 | 428.6 | 70 |
| 9 | 7.50 | 60 | 357 | 2856 | 888 | 660 | 4404.0 | 772.6 | 65 |
| 10 | 3.00 | 48 | 95 | 1520 | 153 | 400 | 2073.0 | 363.7 | 73 |
| 11 | 7.50 | 48 | 209 | 1338 | 20 | 0 | 1357.6 | 238.2 | 99 |
| 12 | 2.30 | 48 | 88 | 1837 | 91 | 630 | 2557.5 | 448.7 | 72 |
| 13 | 5.00 | 40 | 165 | 1320 | 100 | 0 | 1420.0 | 249.1 | 93 |
| 14 | 6.90 | 64 | 220 | 2041 | 1014 | 0 | 3054.6 | 535.9 | 67 |
| 15 | 3.25 | 48 | 75 | 1108 | 100 | 0 | 1207.7 | 211.9 | 92 |
| 16 | 1.70 | 40 | 120 | 2824 | 20 | 0 | 2843.5 | 498.9 | 99 |
| 17 | 6.25 | 64 | 258 | 2642 | 704 | 770 | 4115.9 | 722.1 | 64 |
| 18 | 7.50 | 64 | 168 | 1434 | 56 | 0 | 1489.6 | 261.3 | 96 |
| 19 | 6.00 | 64 | 200 | 2133 | 753 | 500 | 3386.3 | 594.1 | 63 |
| 20 | 4.75 | 48 | 156 | 1576 | 715 | 0 | 2291.4 | 402.0 | 69 |
| Avrg. | 5.23 | 52.1 | 206.2 | 1839.9 | 301.7 | 242.0 | 2383.5 | 418.2 | 80.12 |

Total irrigation cost was mostly constituted by electrical energy cost. The ratio of electrical energy cost to irrigation cost varied between 54 - 99% and average of the research site was 80.1%.

3.3. The other production costs

The other production costs apart from irrigation was also determined and provided in Table 5. The lowest other costs were 1437.1 TL ha⁻¹ (252.1 \$ ha⁻¹), the greatest value was 3573.8 TL ha⁻¹ (627.0 \$ ha⁻¹) and the average of the research site was calculated as

Table 5
The other production costs

2263.0 TL ha⁻¹ (397.0 \$ ha⁻¹). As can be inferred from Table 5, fertilizer cost had the greatest ratio in the other costs apart from irrigation. Fertilizer costs of the farmers varied between 00.0 TL kg⁻¹ (0.0 \$ kg⁻¹) – 1240 TL ha⁻¹ (217.5 \$ ha⁻¹) with an average value of 704.2 TL ha⁻¹ (123.1 \$ ha⁻¹). Such differences were mostly resulted from unit price and quantity of the seeds used since the seeds are usually priced based on their yield potentials and resistance to pests and diseases.

| Farmrs | Soil Tillage cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Seedbed preparation cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Seed Cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Seeding Costs (TL ha ⁻¹) | Chemical cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Hoeing cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Fertilizer cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Harvest cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Total cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Total cost (\$ ha ⁻¹) |
|--------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | 82.5 | 60.4 | 283.5 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 117.3 | 0.0 | 280.0 | 1943.7 | 341.0 |
| 2 | 113.8 | 164.7 | 360.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 504.0 | 280.0 | 1542.5 | 270.6 |
| 3 | 123.4 | 177.4 | 540.0 | 120.0 | 400.0 | 120.0 | 1020.0 | 240.0 | 2740.8 | 480.8 |
| 4 | 122.2 | 158.4 | 440.0 | 160.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 724.0 | 240.0 | 1904.6 | 334.1 |
| 5 | 106.5 | 136.7 | 408.0 | 160.0 | 0.0 | 160.0 | 1240.0 | 280.0 | 2491.2 | 437.1 |
| 6 | 107.5 | 160.3 | 640.0 | 120.0 | 36.0 | 140.0 | 1000.0 | 280.0 | 3573.8 | 627.0 |
| 7 | 107.2 | 168.9 | 384.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 1040.0 | 280.0 | 2165.6 | 379.9 |
| 8 | 149.3 | 614.3 | 378.0 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 69.9 | 462.0 | 280.0 | 2035.5 | 357.1 |
| 9 | 100.3 | 141.2 | 720.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 64.5 | 1040.0 | 320.0 | 2506.0 | 439.6 |
| 10 | 87.9 | 175.5 | 400.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 32.6 | 420.0 | 280.0 | 1516.0 | 266.0 |
| 11 | 84.6 | 85.4 | 383.0 | 140.0 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 420.0 | 280.0 | 1437.1 | 252.1 |
| 12 | 81 | 163.2 | 425.0 | 160.0 | 104.0 | 51.7 | 260.0 | 280.0 | 1524.9 | 267.5 |
| 13 | 200 | 160.0 | 640.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 120.0 | 642.0 | 240.0 | 3452.0 | 605.6 |
| 14 | 141.2 | 175.5 | 585.0 | 160.0 | 35.2 | 160.0 | 780.0 | 320.0 | 2356.9 | 413.5 |
| 15 | 101.9 | 159.5 | 338.0 | 120.0 | 50.5 | 32.6 | 1200.0 | 280.0 | 2282.5 | 400.4 |
| 16 | 116.3 | 81.9 | 360.0 | 120.0 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 1100.0 | 280.0 | 2129.8 | 373.6 |
| 17 | 112.1 | 211.2 | 480.0 | 70.0 | 52.1 | 35.3 | 768.0 | 280.0 | 3408.7 | 598.0 |
| 18 | 100.1 | 159.0 | 627.0 | 120.0 | 0.0 | 41.1 | 440.0 | 240.0 | 1727.2 | 303.0 |
| 19 | 113.4 | 147.9 | 424.0 | 66.0 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 764.0 | 280.0 | 1843.9 | 323.5 |
| 20 | 117.6 | 88.8 | 640.0 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 260.0 | 240.0 | 2677.0 | 469.6 |
| Avrg. | 113.4 | 169.5 | 472.8 | 120.0 | 40.5 | 67.6 | 704.2 | 274.0 | 2263.0 | 397.0 |

3.4. Total production costs

Total production costs of the oil sunflower farmers using groundwater irrigations were calculated and provided in Table 6. The lowest total production cost was 2794.7 TL ha⁻¹ (490.3 \$ ha⁻¹), the greatest value was 7524.6 TL ha⁻¹ (1320.1 \$ ha⁻¹) and the average of the research site was calculated as 4646.5 TL ha⁻¹ (815.2 \$ ha⁻¹). About 29-68% of total production costs were constituted by irrigation cost. As can be seen in Table 6, there were two groups for the ratio of irrigation costs in total costs (the first group had a ratio of between 29.15 - 34.61% and the second group had a ratio of between 46.13 - 68.00%). The group with the lowest ratio of irrigation costs (4 farmers) was composed of the farmers using the least amount of irrigation water (230 - 290 mm) and not paying for irrigation labor. The group with greater ratios of irrigation costs generally composed of the farmers using greater quantities of irrigation water and paying

for irrigation labor. The average ratio of irrigation costs in total costs was identified as 50%. In other words, about half of total production costs was constituted by irrigation costs.

3.5. Gross production value

Gross production values of the oil sunflower farmers of the research site were calculated and results are provided in Table 7. As can be seen from the table, the lowest gross production value was calculated as 5500.0 TL ha⁻¹ (964.9 \$ ha⁻¹), the greatest gross production value was calculated as 10070.0 TL ha⁻¹ (1766.7 \$ ha⁻¹) and the average value was calculated as 8208.3 TL ha⁻¹ (1440.1 \$ ha⁻¹). As can be inferred from Table 7, the net incomes gained from harvested yields varied between 906.7 TL ha⁻¹ (159.1 \$ ha⁻¹) and 6371.2 TL ha⁻¹ (1117.8 \$ ha⁻¹) with an average value of 3561.8 TL ha⁻¹ (624.9 \$ ha⁻¹).

Table 6
Total production costs

| Боличана | Irrigation | The other | Total Production | Total Production | Ratio of irriga- tion cost to total |
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Farmers | Cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Costs (TL ha ⁻¹) | Cost (TL ha ⁻¹) | Cost (\$ ha ⁻¹) | production cost (%) |
| 1 | 1842.0 | 1943.7 | 3785.7 | 664.2 | 48.7 |
| 2 | 3276.0 | 1542.5 | 4818.5 | 845.4 | 68.0 |
| 3 | 1305.8 | 2740.8 | 4046.6 | 709.9 | 32.3 |
| 4 | 2317.0 | 1904.6 | 4221.6 | 740.6 | 54.9 |
| 5 | 2551.0 | 2491.2 | 5042.2 | 884.6 | 50.6 |
| 6 | 1672.0 | 3573.8 | 5245.8 | 920.3 | 31.9 |
| 7 | 2063.2 | 2165.6 | 4228.8 | 741.9 | 48.8 |
| 8 | 2442.7 | 2035.5 | 4478.2 | 785.7 | 54.5 |
| 9 | 4404.0 | 2506.0 | 6910.0 | 1212.3 | 63.7 |
| 10 | 2073.0 | 1516.0 | 3589.0 | 629.6 | 57.8 |
| 11 | 1357.6 | 1437.1 | 2794.7 | 490.3 | 48.6 |
| 12 | 2557.5 | 1524.9 | 4082.4 | 716.2 | 62.6 |
| 13 | 1420.0 | 3452.0 | 4872.0 | 854.7 | 29.1 |
| 14 | 3054.6 | 2356.9 | 5411.5 | 949.4 | 56.4 |
| 15 | 1207.7 | 2282.5 | 3490.2 | 612.3 | 34.6 |
| 16 | 2843.5 | 2129.8 | 4973.3 | 872.5 | 57.2 |
| 17 | 4115.9 | 3408.7 | 7524.6 | 1320.1 | 54.7 |
| 18 | 1489.6 | 1727.2 | 3216.8 | 564.4 | 46.3 |
| 19 | 3386.3 | 1843.9 | 5230.2 | 917.6 | 64.7 |
| 20 | 2291.4 | 2677.0 | 4968.4 | 871.7 | 46.1 |
| Avrg. | 2383.5 | 2263.0 | 4646.5 | 815.2 | 50.6 |

Table 7 Gross production value

| Farmers | Yield | Sales price | Gross production | Gross production | Net income | Net Income |
|---------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | (kg ha ⁻¹) | $(TL kg^{-1})$ | value(TL ha ⁻¹) | value(\$ ha ⁻¹) | (TL ha ⁻¹) | (\$ ha ⁻¹) |
| 1 | 3728.0 | 2.64 | 9841.9 | 1726.7 | 6056.2 | 1062.5 |
| 2 | 2660.0 | 2.40 | 6384.0 | 1120.0 | 1565.5 | 274.6 |
| 3 | 3000.0 | 2.50 | 7500.0 | 1315.8 | 3453.4 | 605.9 |
| 4 | 2200.0 | 2.50 | 5500.0 | 964.9 | 1278.4 | 224.3 |
| 5 | 2600.0 | 2.30 | 5980.0 | 1049.1 | 937.8 | 164.5 |
| 6 | 3680.0 | 2.45 | 9016.0 | 1581.8 | 3770.2 | 661.4 |
| 7 | 3600.0 | 2.70 | 9720.0 | 1705.3 | 5491.2 | 963.4 |
| 8 | 3770.0 | 2.60 | 9802.0 | 1719.6 | 5323.8 | 934.0 |
| 9 | 3600.0 | 2.42 | 8712.0 | 1528.4 | 1802.0 | 316.1 |
| 10 | 3480.0 | 2.65 | 9222.0 | 1617.9 | 5633.0 | 988.2 |
| 11 | 2800.0 | 2.45 | 6860.0 | 1203.5 | 4065.3 | 713.2 |
| 12 | 2200.0 | 2.50 | 5500.0 | 964.9 | 1417.6 | 248.7 |
| 13 | 3800.0 | 2.65 | 10070.0 | 1766.7 | 5198.0 | 911.9 |
| 14 | 4000.0 | 2.37 | 9480.0 | 1663.2 | 4068.5 | 713.8 |
| 15 | 3000.0 | 2.51 | 7530.0 | 1321.1 | 4039.8 | 708.7 |
| 16 | 2400.0 | 2.45 | 5880.0 | 1031.6 | 906.7 | 159.1 |
| 17 | 3800.0 | 2.46 | 9348.0 | 1640.0 | 1823.4 | 319.9 |
| 18 | 3400.0 | 2.82 | 9588.0 | 1682.1 | 6371.2 | 1117.8 |
| 19 | 3400.0 | 2.48 | 8432.0 | 1479.3 | 3201.8 | 561.7 |
| 20 | 4000.0 | 2.45 | 9800.0 | 1719.3 | 4831.6 | 847.6 |
| Avrg. | 3255.9 | 2.52 | 8208.3 | 1440.1 | 3561.8 | 624.9 |

3.6. Economic indicators

Some economic indicators calculated within the scope of this study are provided in Table 8. In Turkey in 2018, fertilizer and fuel support were implemented as 230 TL ha-1 and direct yield support was implemented as 0.40 TL kg-1. State supports were added to net incomes provided in Table 7 and resultant

net incomes per unit area are provided in Table 8. The lowest net income for oil sunflower production was calculated as 2096.7 TL ha $^{\!-1}$ (367.8 $\$ ha $^{\!-1}$), the greatest net income was calculated as 7961.2 TL ha $^{\!-1}$ (1396.7 $\$ ha $^{\!-1}$) and average of the research site was calculated as 5094.1 TL ha $^{\!-1}$ (893.7 $\$ ha $^{\!-1}$).

Table 8
Economic Assessment Indicators

| Production supports | | orts | Fertilize supp | ort | net in | State-supported net income | | Economic produc- tivity | | omic on water ctivity | Breakeven point |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| | TL kg ⁻¹ | \$ kg ⁻¹ | TL ha ⁻¹ | \$ kg ⁻¹ | TL ha ⁻¹ | \$ ha ⁻¹ | kg TL ⁻¹ | kg \$ ⁻¹ | TL m ⁻³ | \$ m ⁻³ | kg ha ⁻¹ |
| 1 | 1491.2 | 261.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 7777.4 | 1364.5 | 0.98 | 5.61 | 1.93 | 0.34 | 1434.0 |
| 2 | 1064.0 | 186.7 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 2859.5 | 501.7 | 0.55 | 3.15 | 0.45 | 0.08 | 2007.7 |
| 3 | 1200.0 | 210.5 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 4883.4 | 856.7 | 0.74 | 4.23 | 1.71 | 0.30 | 1618.6 |
| 4 | 880.0 | 154.4 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 2388.4 | 419.0 | 0.52 | 2.97 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 1688.6 |
| 5 | 1040.0 | 182.5 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 2207.8 | 387.3 | 0.52 | 2.94 | 0.39 | 0.07 | 2192.3 |
| 6 | 1472.0 | 258.2 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 5472.2 | 960.0 | 0.70 | 4.00 | 2.38 | 0.42 | 2141.1 |
| 7 | 1440.0 | 252.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 7161.2 | 1256.4 | 0.85 | 4.85 | 1.73 | 0.30 | 1566.2 |
| 8 | 1508.0 | 264.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 7061.8 | 1238.9 | 0.84 | 4.80 | 1.83 | 0.32 | 1722.4 |
| 9 | 1440.0 | 252.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 3472.0 | 609.1 | 0.52 | 2.97 | 0.68 | 0.12 | 2852.1 |
| 10 | 1392.0 | 244.2 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 7255.0 | 1272.8 | 0.97 | 5.53 | 2.12 | 0.37 | 1354.3 |
| 11 | 1120.0 | 196.5 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 5415.3 | 950.1 | 1.00 | 6.30 | 1.80 | 0.33 | 1034.6 |
| 12 | 880.0 | 154.4 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 2527.6 | 443.4 | 0.54 | 3.07 | 0.61 | 0.11 | 1633.0 |
| 13 | 1520.0 | 266.7 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 6948.0 | 1218.9 | 0.78 | 4.45 | 2.34 | 0.41 | 1838.5 |
| 14 | 1600.0 | 280.7 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 5898.5 | 1034.8 | 0.74 | 4.22 | 1.28 | 0.23 | 2281.6 |
| 15 | 1200.0 | 210.5 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 5469.8 | 959.6 | 0.86 | 4.90 | 2.19 | 0.39 | 1390.5 |
| 16 | 960.0 | 168.4 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 2096.7 | 367.8 | 0.48 | 2.40 | 0.33 | 0.04 | 2029.9 |
| 17 | 1520.0 | 266.7 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 3573.4 | 626.9 | 0.51 | 2.88 | 0.80 | 0.14 | 3058.8 |
| 18 | 1360.0 | 238.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 7961.2 | 1396.7 | 1.06 | 6.02 | 2.47 | 0.37 | 1140.7 |
| 19 | 1360.0 | 238.6 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 4791.8 | 840.7 | 0.65 | 3.71 | 1.00 | 0.13 | 2109.0 |
| 20 | 1600.0 | 280.7 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 6661.6 | 1168.7 | 0.81 | 4.59 | 1.88 | 0.33 | 2027.9 |
| Avrg. | 1302.4 | 228.5 | 230.0 | 40.4 | 5094.1 | 893.7 | 0.73 | 4.18 | 1.44 | 0.25 | 1856.1 |

Economic productivity (EP) values varied between 0.48 - 1.06 kg TL⁻¹ with an average value of 0.73 kg TL⁻¹. These values revealed that the lowest values belonged to the farmers applying more than 400 mm irrigation water. As can be inferred from Table 8, net income per unit of irrigation water varied from one farmer to another. Economic irrigation water productivity (EIWP) of the farmers varied between 0.33 TL m⁻³ - 2.47 TL m⁻³ with an average value of 1.44 TL m⁻³. Again, the farmers applying greater than 400 mm irrigation water had low EIWP values. In this production quantities corresponding production costs of oil sunflower cultivation were also determined. This indictor so called as breakeven point varied between 1034.6 - 3058.8 kg ha⁻¹ with an average value of 1856.1 kg ha⁻¹.

4. Conclusion

In this study, economic analysis was conducted for groundwater-irrigated oil sunflower farming in Konya region. Present findings revealed that irrigation was the most significant input, thus constituted the greatest cost item in oil sunflower production. Electricity had the greatest ratio in irrigation costs. Electricity cost of groundwater-irrigated oil sunflower farming constituted 80.12% of irrigation costs and 39.6% of total production cost. Some farmers of the research site had low net incomes because of excessive or high quantities of irrigation water they used. It was observed that there were not significant differences in yields of the farmers applying the lowest irrigation water quantities (2304 m³ ha⁻¹) and the greatest irrigation water quantities (6352.94 m³ ha⁻¹). It was concluded based on present findings that farmers applying high quantities of irrigation water did not get high yield level and vice versa. It was also concluded that under provincial conditions of Konya, 250 - 350 mm irrigation water was sufficient and such a quantity provided the greatest net income.

5. References

- ASAE (1999). ASAE Standarts. D497.4 MAR99: Agricultural Machinery Data. pp. 350-357 ASAE 2950 *Niles Rd.*, *St. Joseph*, MI, 49085-9659, USA.
- Ballestero E (2000). Economía de la empresa agraria y alimentaria. *Mundi-Prensa*, *Madrid*, p 416 (in Spanish).
- Çetin Ö, Kara A (2019). Assesment of water productivity using different drip irrigation systems for cotton. *Agric Water Manag*, 223: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.105693.
- Das LK, Rout RK (2018). Economic analysis of Sunflower Enterprise in Western Odisha. *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci*, 6(4): 498-505.
- García-García J, Romero P, Botía P, García F (2004). Costbenefit analysis of almond orchard under regulated defcit irrigation (RDI) in SE Spain. Span J Agric Res, 2(2): 157–165.
- FAOSTAT (2019). Crops. http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#home (Erişim tarihi 10.05.2019).

- Karaağaç HA, Bolat A, Sağlam C, Yazgan E, Çil A (2018). Ayçiçeği Üretiminin Enerji ve Ekonomik Analizi: Adana İli Örneği. Uluslararası Doğu Akdeniz Tarımsal Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1(2): 1-12.
- KBSKB (2017). Konya bölgesi sulama kooperatifleri birliği. Bilgi formu. Konya.
- Konya Sugar co (2019).

 http://www.konyaseker.com.tr/tr/haber/detay/10156/uretici-ezilmesin-diye-devlet-fiyat-acikladi-(Erişim tarihi 10.09.2019
- Layard R, Glaister S (1994). Cost-beneWt analysis. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, p 497.
- MBM (2019). Konya Meteoroloji Bölge Müdürlüğü kayıtları. Konya
- Pereira LS, Cordery I, Iacovides I (2012). Improved indicators of water use performance and productivity for sustainable water conservation and saving. Agric Water Manag, 108: 39–51.
- Semerci A, Kaya Y, Durak S (2007). Economic analysis of sunflower production in Turkey. *HELIA*, 30 (47):105-114.
- Sethar AA, Noonari S, Memon IN, Memon Z, Pathan A, Manzoor A, Pathan M (2015). Comparative Economic Analysis of Hybrid V/S Conventionalsunflower Production Sindh Pakistan. *Industrial Engineering Letters*, 5(7): 34-42.
- Topak R, Süheri S, Acar B (2008).İklim-tarımsal kuraklıksulama ve çevre etkileşimi yönünden Konya havzası. V. Dünya Su Forumu Türkiye Bölgesel Su Toplantıları. Konya Kapalı havzası yeraltısuyu ve kuraklık konferansı, Bildiri kitabı, 67-76. 11-12 Eylül 2008, Konya.
- Topak R, Acar B, Uyanöz R, Ceyhan E (2016). Performance of partial root-zone drip irrigation for sugar beetproduction in a semi-arid area. *Agric Water Manag*, 176: 180–190.
- TÜİK, (2019). Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, web sayfası. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/
- Unakıtan G, Aydın A (2018). A comparison of energy use efficiency and economic analysis of wheat and sunflower production in Turkey: A case study in Thrace Region. *Energy*, 149:279-285.
- Yavuz D, Seymen M, Yavuz N, Türkmen Ö (2015). Effects of irrigation interval and quantity on the yield and quality of confectionary pumpkin grown under field conditions. *Agric Water Manag*, 159: 290–298.
- Yavuz N, Çiftçi N, Yavuz D (2016). The effects of deficit irrigation on yield of sunflower. IV. International Chemical Engineering and Technologies Conference, P: 20-27, November 2016, İstanbul.
- Yavuz D, Acar B, Yavuz N, Çiftçi N (2018). Irrigation in various growth stages effect on yield and water productivity of dripirrigated sunflower in semi-arid konya environment, Turkey. *International Journal of Agriculture and Economic Development*, 6(2), 7-17.
- Yavuz N, Çiftçi N, Yavuz D. (2019). Effects of different irrigation interval and plant-pan coefficient applications on yield and quality parameters of oil sunflower grown in semi-arid climatic conditions. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences* 12:672, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-019-4867-1.