

## Abstract

Researchers abound in every sphere of knowledge or discipline. This is more so in an applied discipline like Agricultural Economics. But while some researchers are characterized by research discipline others are characterized by research indiscipline (indiscipline in research). Hence, there are researchers and there are researchers.

The idea behind this lecture is to gear-up researchers to be mindful of the issues raised and to be aware of doing the needful in their field of specialization. Hence, it is to inculcate research discipline as against research indiscipline (indiscipline in research) in the potential researchers.

Within the nexus of discipline, research and development and the Carnegie triple of be disciplined, be interdisciplinary, and have an active mind in research discipline, is not only important in research but also in the life of man and a nation. By developmental economics, development does not start with goods. It starts with the people, their education, organization and discipline. Without these three key elements, all other resources remain latent untapped potential. This assertion tends to be a very perfect fit for the concept that is Nigeria.

The application of linear Abstract production function in Agricultural Production Economics is indicative of research indiscipline. The reference to indiscipline is rooted in the limiting characteristics of the function. These limitations rule it out of serious consideration for application. Despite the limitations, researchers persist in using it. Yet, the model violates the fundamental assumptions characteristic of functional analysis. A production function is theoretically expected to be concaved to the origin. The concavity is reflected in the sign and size of parameters especially the Cobb-Douglas function. The Cobb-Douglas production function has its own peculiar characteristics. Evidence in literature indicates violation of these characteristics. A diligent and disciplined researcher is expected to be aware of these facts. A failure to do this resulting in misestimation or mis-interpretation of the results, constitutes indiscipline in research.

In resource-use efficiency studies, most researchers concentrate on the necessary condition for the study, not paying attention to the sufficient condition for the study. Such studies are devoid of the scientific hypothesis testing aspect. Often the studies are characterized by faulty model specifications. The relevant test-statistics exist in the literature but lack of diligent search pushes the researchers into the pit of indiscipline in research.

Many estimated deterministic models are characterized by misspecification and the inclusion of socioeconomic variables that are not proper inputs and are not acceptable theoretically e.g. age, household size, cost of hired labour, farming experience, education. This lapse is classified as being due to indiscipline in research. Many estimated stochastic frontier production and cost functions do not follow the prescribed ground rules. Hence, there is anti-duality theory that states that the two functions are mirror image of one another. Most of the estimated models suffer from structural defects, misspecification, variables and misinterpretation of parameters. These are indicative of research indiscipline.

There are some researchers who follow the ground rules/duality theory and come out with reasonable, acceptable and genuinely publishable results. These are defined as diligent and disciplined researchers with their works being indicative of research discipline.

Many researches however are characterized by misconceptualization of the research problems, misspecification of the models, misestimation of the models, misinterpretation of the empirical results and mispolicy formulation. These harvests of errors, as a result of lack of due diligence, impinge on the policy relevance and usefulness of most studies for the results constitute the basis for the implications. These are the bane of the applied discipline of Agricultural Economics.

The bottom line is that when the economy suffers from policy distortion, policy mistakes, policy somersault, policy failure, policy reversal, the fault may not necessarily be that of the policy implementers/implementors, and/or the government but the fault of the policy presenters (researchers) who provided the faulty policy recommendations.