

Analysis of Sustainable Market Conditions and Determinants Influencing Farmers' Involvement in the Commercialization of Cocoyam in Anambra State, Nigeria

Abstract: This study on the analysis of sustainable market conditions and determinants influencing farmers' involvement in the commercialization of cocoyam in Anambra State, Nigeria focused on six specific objectives that ascertained the market conditions for cocoyam marketing, identified the commercialization index of the commodity, described the determinants of farmers' participation in the commercialization of the commodity, estimated the profitability of smallholder's cocoyam production/marketing, and its determinants, and identified the challenges to cocoyam production/marketing in the area. A multistage sampling technique involving purposive and simple random sampling was employed to collect data from 368 cocoyam farmers. The study used a combination of analytical tools such as descriptive statistics, the Lorenz curve, marketing margin analysis, and ordinary least square regression achieved from the SPSS version 25 and Microsoft Excel. The study revealed the farmers' average age and production/marketing experience as 19 years. The Gini coefficient value of 0.236 closer to zero shows a near-perfect condition in the area, with a 68.0% commercialization index. Gender (11.48)***, marital status (8.98)***, and cooperative membership (4.81)** are the positive factors influencing market participation. The farmers realized a profitability ratio of 0.74 and a return on investment of 1.85. This profitability ratios are positively determined by sex (16.45)***, farming experience (4.58)***, and number of extension contacts (6.48)***. The farmers face the following challenges; inadequate capital, limited access to improved cultivars, and bad road networks among others. However, policymakers should therefore prioritize intervention to address the identified bottlenecks hindering market participation, profitability, and scalability of cocoyam production and marketing.

Keywords: market structure, participation, commodity, commercialization, cocoyam

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Cocoyam (*Colocasia and Xanthosoma spp*) is a staple root crop in many developing countries of Africa, Asia, and the Pacific (Boakye *et al.*, 2018; Muthoni and Shimelis, 2023). It is an important source of food, income, and employment for millions of smallholder farmers, especially in Nigeria, which is the largest producer of the crop in the world (Opata, and Adeosun, 2016). However, cocoyam has received little attention from both government and research communities, compared to other root and tuber crops such as cassava and yam (Otekunrinet *al.*, 2021; Ukwuet *al.*, 2022). As a result, the potential of cocoyam to contribute to food security, poverty reduction and economic development has not been fully realized (Nkemeet *al.*, 2021). However, Osuaforet *al.* (2020); and Jung (2023) submitted that, ensuring food security in a country is often a safeguard against issues such as hunger and malnutrition, which can impede

economic progress. Again, cocoyam processing into flour, chips, and other value-added products provides opportunities for entrepreneurship and the development of small-scale industries (Adeyanju *et al.*, 2019).

One of the key challenges facing cocoyam production and marketing is the lack of a well-developed and efficient market system, which has severally resulted in imperfect market competition or inequality in revenue allocation (Opata, and Adeosun, 2016; Ifeanyi-Obi *et al.*, 2017). However, Anumudu *et al.* (2020) noted that a well-functioning market is needed to promote agriculture-driven economic growth and uplift rural incomes. Regrettably in Anambra State in particular and Nigeria in general, the market conditions of cocoyam are characterized by low and unstable prices, high transaction costs, poor quality standards, limited access to market information and credit, and weak linkages among market actors (Nwankwo *et al.*, 2023). Bedru and Motunrayo (2022) confirmed that many cocoyam farmers lack access to formal credit facilities, making it difficult for them to invest in improved farming practices, such as the use of high-quality seeds, fertilizers, and mechanized equipment. Ifeanyi-Obi *et al.* (2017); Temidayo *et al.* (2021); and Zhao *et al.* (2021) equally revealed that smallholder farmers often lack timely and accurate information about market demand, prices, and quality standards. Owusu-Darko *et al.* (2014) believe that cocoyam is a perishable crop, and farmers often struggle with post-harvest losses due to inadequate storage facilities and poor transportation infrastructure. These factors limit the profitability and competitiveness of cocoyam and discourage farmers from investing in the crop and participating in the market. Kotchikpa, and Wendkouni (2016) and Nkeme *et al.* (2021) in their study argued that these factors affect the commercialization index of smallholder cocoyam farmers. Omotesho *et al.* (2020) stated that smallholder farmers are primarily responsible for the cultivation and supply of cocoyam commodity

As an age-long practice of subsistent agriculture in Africa, many farmers produce for household consumption with little to sell to meet family needs (Giller *et al.*, 2021), however, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO, 2017) submitted that smallholder farmers have been advised to take advantage of agribusiness opportunities to participate in direct marketing of their farm produce to reduce the interference of middlemen who reap off their profit in the agricultural enterprise. This is what differentiates this study from previous studies like Opata, 2018; Nwafor,

2021; and Ridwan *et al.*, 2022) which focused on either the production or marketing aspect of the cocoyam value chain in Africa.

The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) is a wonderful initiative that aims to create a single market for goods and services, business, and investment across the 55 member states of the African Union (AU) (Sharkdam and Jamaludden, 2022). The AfCFTA has the potential to boost intra-African trade, enhance regional integration, promote industrialization and diversification, and foster economic growth and development (Ismail, 2019). The AfCFTA also offers a unique opportunity for cocoyam producers and marketers to access a larger and more dynamic market, improve their productivity and profitability, and increase their value addition and competitiveness (Aigheyisi, and Iyoha, 2022). For effective participation in a larger market like AfCFTA, there is a need to understand the farmers' managerial and socioeconomic characteristics that are either positively or negatively influencing their profitability, and the commercialization index which is defined as the degree to which farmers sell their output in the market, as opposed to consuming it at home or exchanging it for other goods and services (Abdullah *et al.*, 2019). However, to realize the benefits of the AfCFTA, cocoyam stakeholders need to understand the market dynamics of cocoyam and the factors that influence the level of commercialization of the crop. This definition confirmed that commercialization has implications for farmers' income, welfare, and livelihood strategies, as well as for the overall performance of the cocoyam sector. The study by Boakye-Achampong *et al.* (2017); Tariku *et al.* (2021); Ridwan *et al.*, (2022) listed the determinants of commercialization as the level of education, household size, and farm size, and access to credit among others. A detailed analysis of this study's determinants will help policymakers design interventions that are tailored to promoting cocoyam commercialization in the Anambra State. Reiteratively, Ezeano *et al.* (2017) argued that commercialization is influenced by various factors, such as market conditions, production factors, household characteristics, institutional factors, and policy environment. This study is among the recent studies to integrate the production and marketing of cocoyam to uncover the agribusiness opportunity in the sector. Though Omotesho *et al.* (2020) and Nwafor (2021) attempted to identify the variables influencing farmers' attitudes and choices regarding participation in the commercialization of cocoyam, they did not adequately describe the market conduct and structure conditions of cocoyam farming. This contributes to the novelty of this

study. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the sustainable market conditions and determinants influencing farmers' involvement in the commercialization of cocoyam in Anambra State, Nigeria.

At the end of this study, the researcher(s) aims to gain a deep understating of the market condition of cocoyam marketing, quantify the level of commercialization, and uncover the factors influencing farmers' involvement in the commercialization process of cocoyam production and marketing. The study will contribute to the existing literature on cocoyam marketing and commercialization, and the policy discourse on the AfCFTA and its implications for the agricultural sector in Anambra State in particular and Nigeria and Africa in general.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are to:

- i. ascertain the market conditions of cocoyam marketing in the study area;
- ii. identify the commercialization index of the cocoyam commodity;
- iii. describe the determinants of farmers' participation in the commercialization of the cocoyam commodity;
- iv. estimate the profitability of smallholders' cocoyam production/marketing;
- v. describe the determinants of profitability of smallholder cocoyam production; and
- vi. identify the challenges of smallholder cocoyam production/marketing.

2.0 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

2.1 The market conditions of cocoyam marketing

Fadipe, Adenuga, and Raji (2015) investigated cocoyam marketing in Sagamu Local Government Area, Ogun State, Nigeria. They collected primary data from 120 traders using

random sampling. Analysis of the Gini Coefficient revealed values of 0.433 for wholesalers and 0.506 for retailers, indicating an imperfect market condition

Similarly, Osalusi and Oloba (2018) examined the market structure of yam in selected markets in Ibadan, Oyo State. Employing simple random sampling techniques, they surveyed 120 yam sellers and utilized Gross margin and Gini coefficient techniques for data analysis. Their study yielded a Gini coefficient value of 0.572, indicating an imperfect competitive market structure.

In another study, Opata, Adeosun, and Ozor (2018) examined the market structure and conduct of cocoyam in the industry in South East, Nigeria. Their research involved data collection from a random sample of 260 farmers, wholesalers, and retailers. They utilized concentration ratios, the Gini coefficient, and the Herfindahl-Hirschman index for data analysis. The Gini coefficient and Lorenz curve plotted from the data indicated values of 0.55 for farmers, 0.56 for wholesalers, and 0.70 for retailers, suggesting an inequitable distribution of market shares and income among marketers.

Similarly, Nwankwo, Ugwumba, and Chiekezie, Ozor (2023) conducted a study on the Structure and Profitability of Wholesale Marketing of Cocoyam in Southeast, Nigeria. Their research utilized multistage, purposive, and random sampling techniques to gather data, administering a structured questionnaire to 216 cocoyam wholesale marketers. Market concentration, indicative of the nature of competition, was assessed using the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz curve. Their findings revealed a Gini Coefficient value of 0.5642, suggesting a significant concentration of market revenue among a small number of wholesale marketers.

2.2 The commercialization index of the cocoyam commodity and its determinants

Omotesho, Kayode, Adebayo, Akinrinde, and Mohammed (2020) conducted a research project in Oyun Local Government Area, Kwara State, Nigeria, aiming to evaluate the potential for cocoyam commercialization. They utilized a two-stage random sampling method, resulting in 154 respondents. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics and multiple regression. The study disclosed that farmers' average age was 53.9 years, with an average farming experience of 22 years and a farm size averaging 4.3 acres. The awareness level regarding cocoyam's uses was high, with 73.52% of respondents displaying knowledge. Additionally, farmers generally showed

a favorable attitude (mean score = 2.38) toward cocoyam commercialization, indicating significant potential in the area.

Similarly, Ogundele (2020) investigated factors influencing output commercialization among small-scale farmers in Nigeria, utilizing panel data from the National Bureau to survey households in wave 2 and 3. The analysis incorporated household commercialization index and Tobit regression. Findings revealed commercialization indices of 0.45 and 0.77 for wave 2 and 3 respectively, with determinants including age, sex, and farm size.

Hussayn, Gulak, Aboaba, and Keshinro (2020) conducted a study in Oyo State on the impacts of agricultural commercialization on the poverty status of smallholder cassava farming households. They employed a multistage sampling method to select 189 households, analyzing the data using household commercialization index, FGT index, ordered probit model, and logistic regression model. Demographically, the study noted average age, household size, and farming experience of 42 years, 5 people, and 12 years respectively. The household commercialization index stood at 0.58, influenced by factors such as education level and farming experience.

2.3 The profitability of smallholders' cocoyam production/marketing and its determinants

Afolami and Ogungbenro (2017) conducted a study on the profit efficiency of smallholder cocoyam-based farmers and its determinants in Osun State, Nigeria. They utilized multistage and random sampling techniques to select 180 smallholder cocoyam farmers. The study employed the Cobb-Douglas stochastic profit function to achieve its objectives. Results indicated an average profit efficiency of 44.9%, suggesting a potential increase in farmers' profit by 55.1% with the same production cost. Determinants of profit included the level of education, access to credit, farming experience, household size, access to extension services, and marital status.

Similarly, Ridwan and colleagues (2022) investigated the profitability of cocoyam production and its determinants in Cross River State, Nigeria. They employed primary data collected through a structured questionnaire and conducted analyses using cost and return analysis, multiple regression, and the Likert rating scale. Their findings unveiled a return on investment of 3.17, resulting in a profit value of 428.04 USD per hectare. Determinants of profit identified in their study encompassed the level of education, household size, output, cooperative membership, access to credit, and farm size.

Anyiam and colleagues (2023) conducted a study on the economics of cocoyam production in Orsu Local Government Area, Imo State, Nigeria. Their research focused on examining the economics of cocoyam production in the specified area. They collected primary data from 50 smallholder cocoyam farmers using a random sampling technique. The data underwent analysis through descriptive statistics, Gross Margin Model, Ordinary Least Square multiple regression analysis, and Profitability Index Model. The findings revealed an internal rate of return of 1.65, indicating that for every ₦1 invested in cocoyam production, ₦1.65kobo was realized. The study also identified several factors influencing cocoyam output, including the quantity of fertilizer, farm experience, access to credit, household size, and membership of cooperatives. Furthermore, the profitability index of cocoyam production was determined to be 2.44, indicating a high level of profitability.

2.4 The challenges of smallholder cocoyam production/marketing

Wilcox, Ugwumba, Achike, Agbagwaa, and Uche (2016) investigated the efficiency of smallholder cocoyam farmers in South-South Nigeria. They employed multistage, purposive, and random sampling techniques to select 200 cocoyam farmers for their survey. Descriptive statistics and the Cobb-Douglas stochastic frontier cost function were utilized for data analyses. The study revealed various constraints affecting cocoyam production, including the scarcity of improved high-yielding corms, lack of capital, high labour costs, expensive transportation, inadequate storage facilities, and challenges posed by diseases and pests.

In a similar study, Ariyo, Usman, Olagunju, Oluyemisi, and Ademuwagun (2021) conducted a study on the determinants of the input-output relationship of yam production in the Gboyin Local Government Area of Ekiti State, Nigeria. They utilized multistage sampling techniques to select 140 farmers for their research. The study employed descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis for data analysis. The challenges identified in yam production within the study area encompass inadequate capital, high input costs, pest and disease incidence, insufficient planting materials, lack of storage facilities, poor soil conditions, unfavourable produce prices, inadequate transportation infrastructure, limited extension services, insufficient farmland, and difficulties accessing farm inputs.

2.5 Research gap

Based on the researcher's review, several potential research gaps emerge from the existing literature:

1. Market Conditions of Cocoyam Marketing in Anambra State, Nigeria: Previous studies have predominantly focused on cocoyam marketing in the Southeast zone as a whole or other geopolitical zones, neglecting a specific examination of Anambra State. Comparing and contrasting the market structure, conduct, and performance of cocoyam marketing in Anambra State with other regions or crops using appropriate indicators and methodologies could provide valuable insights.
2. Commercialization Index of Cocoyam and Its Determinants in Anambra State, Nigeria: There is a dearth of empirical evidence on the commercialization index of cocoyam and its determinants within Anambra State. Researchers have an opportunity to measure the extent of cocoyam commercialization among farmers in the study area using a suitable index and explore factors influencing their participation in the market. Additionally, investigating the relationship between commercialization, income, food security, and poverty reduction among cocoyam farmers could offer valuable insights.
3. Profitability of Smallholders' Cocoyam Production/Marketing and Its Determinants in Anambra State, Nigeria: Limited research exists on the profitability of smallholder cocoyam production/marketing in Anambra State. Researchers could estimate the costs and returns associated with cocoyam production/marketing among small-scale farmers in the region and analyze factors affecting their profitability. Additionally, exploring opportunities and challenges related to value addition and processing of cocoyam products could enhance their profitability and competitiveness.
4. Challenges of Smallholder Cocoyam Production/Marketing in Anambra State, Nigeria: Further research is needed to identify and prioritize the challenges faced by cocoyam farmers and marketers in Anambra State. Researchers could assess the availability and accessibility of extension services, credit facilities, input supplies, and market information for cocoyam stakeholders in the area, proposing solutions to overcome identified constraints.

These research gaps provide avenues for future studies to contribute to a deeper understanding of cocoyam production and marketing dynamics in Anambra State, Nigeria, ultimately informing policy interventions and enhancing the livelihoods of cocoyam stakeholders.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Area of the Study

The study was conducted in Anambra State, which is located in the southeastern region of Nigeria. Anambra State is comprised of 21 Local Government Areas (LGAs) categorized into four agricultural zones: Anambra, Onitsha, Awka, and Aguata. It shares borders with Delta State to the West, Imo State and Rivers State to the South, Enugu State to the East, and Kogi State to the North (Obianefo, Ezeano, Isibor, and Ahaneku, 2023). The inhabitants of Anambra State primarily engage in farming activities and have a notable history of trade and commerce (Okafor, 2019). Geographically, Anambra State is situated between Latitudes 5°32' and 6°45'N and Longitudes 6°43' and 7°22'E. It spans an estimated land area of 4,865 square kilometers and experiences an average rainfall of 1544 mm. The region has an average temperature of 26.8°C (Climate data: Retrieved March 22, 2021). The ecological conditions in Anambra State are favourable for cocoyam production and its subsequent commercialization.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

Multi-stage and simple random sampling technique was employed to select adequate study representatives. In the first stage, an infinite sample size determination technique was applied at 60% of the proposed population at a 95 confidence level and 0.05 confidence interval. The formula is defined as:

$$SS = \frac{[Z^2 \rho (1 - \rho)]}{C^2}$$

Where:

SS=sample size

Z = given Z value

ρ = percentage of population

C = confidence level. Thus:

$$SS = \frac{[1.96^2 * 0.6(1 - 0.6)]}{0.05^2} = 368.49 \cong 368$$

In stage two, 2 agricultural zones were randomly selected, from where 2 communities were randomly selected to avoid bias sampling.

In the third stage, 2 villages were randomly selected from each community to make it a total of sixteen (16) villages for the study. Finally, at stage forth, twenty-three (23) cocoyam farmers were randomly sampled from each village to bring the sample size to three hundred and sixty-eight (368) respondents for the study. The breakdown of the sample selection is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample selection each of the selected LGA

| Zone | LGAs | Community | Town | Sample size |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------|-------------|
| Aguata | Nnewi South | Amichi | Okpala | 23 |
| | | | Udene | 23 |
| | | Ukpor | Amihe | 23 |
| | | | Egbu | 23 |
| Aguata | Achina | Umuchu | Ogboji | 23 |
| | | | Uga | 23 |
| | | Umuchu | Ugwuakwu | 23 |
| | | | Umugama | 23 |
| Awka | Awka South | Ifite Awka | Akpana. | 23 |
| | | | Enugu | 23 |
| | | Nibo | Ezeawulu | 23 |
| | Umuanum | | 23 | |
| | Awka North | | Achalla | Amukabia |
| | | Odawa | | 23 |
| Ebenebe | | Obuno Okpuno | 23 | |
| | | | Umuoye | 23 |
| Total | | | | 368 |

Source: Researcher's computation, 2023.

Rahman *et al.* (2022) advocated for the adoption of multistage sampling, highlighting its versatility in accommodating various stages of data collection to align with researchers' requirements. Similarly, Moher *et al.* (2010) and Weinreb *et al.* (2018) emphasized how this method facilitates the progression of the study from state to Local Government Area, and from

community to neighbouring villages where cultivation occurs. To enhance the study's credibility, respondents were randomly selected from their respective villages.

Data Collection

Four research assistants were recruited and trained to help with the data collection to save time and ensure wider reach. The research assistants covered one LGA each. The fieldwork lasted from March 20th – April 14th 2023. An Android data collection tool kit (“koboCollect”) was used for the data collection. The structured questionnaire was coded into the App. According to Obianefo *et al.* (2022), utilizing the Android App (“KoboCollect”) for data collection not only aligned with the COVID-19 guidelines by minimizing physical contact but also enhanced the data quality by mitigating the risk of research assistants falsifying information. This was achieved through the direct linkage of the App's database with the analyst's SPSS package database.

Data Analysis

This study used a combination of different analytical tools which include descriptive statistics, a household commercialization index, Gini coefficient, and a multiple regression analysis. Objective one (ascertain the market conditions of cocoyam marketing) was achieved with a Gini coefficient adapted from Nsikan *et al.* (2013). Objective two (identify the commercialization index of the cocoyam commodity) was achieved with a household commercialization index adapted from Mamo and Beguije (2022); Gebre *et al.* (2021). Objective three (describe the determinants of farmers' participation in the commercialization of the cocoyam commodity) was achieved with a multinomial logistic regression adapted from Shah *et al.* (2022).

Model Specification

Gini Coefficient (GC)

In the agricultural sector, the marketing of crops plays a crucial role in determining the economic well-being of farmers and stakeholders involved (Pawlak and Kołodziejczak, 2020). Cocoyam, a nutritious and versatile crop, holds significant importance in many regions

worldwide. To evaluate the distribution of profits and understand the level of inequality within the cocoyam marketing system, the researcher employed a statistical tool called the Gini coefficient. The Gini coefficient is a widely used measure of income or wealth distribution within a given population (Nsikanet *et al.*, 2013), when applied to the cocoyam marketing sector, it helps us evaluate the concentration of profits among market participants, highlighting the potential inequalities by examining the distribution of incomes earned from cocoyam sales. This helps policymakers to gain valuable insights into the fairness of the marketing system and identify areas that require attention. Gona *et al.* (2020) noted that a high Gini coefficient in marketing reflects a potential imbalance in the distribution of profits. It may indicate disparities in pricing, bargaining power, or access to markets and resources. Identifying the causes of inequality can guide policymakers, agricultural organizations, and market participants in implementing strategies to promote fairer trade practices, enhance market access for small-scale farmers, and ensure equitable income distribution.

The Gini coefficient adapted from Nsikanet *et al.* (2013) is defined by:

$$GC = 1 - \sum X_i Y_i$$

Where: GC = Gini coefficient, X = Cumulative percentage of cocoyam farmers/traders, Y = Cumulative percentage of total sales, \sum = Summation sign. The Gini coefficient ranges between 0 and 1, where 0 represents perfect, and 1 represents maximum inequality or high level of market imperfection.

Ordinary Least Square (OLS) Regression

Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression analysis is a widely used statistical method for analyzing the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. It is particularly useful when the relationship between variables is expected to be linear. In the context of cocoyam commercialization, OLS regression can help identify the key determinants that impact the production, marketing, and profitability of cocoyam products. This approach enables researchers to understand and predict outcomes based on multiple predictors. According to Adam and Estevez (2021), OLS incorporates more than one independent variable. Gulden and Nese (2013) further explain that OLS analysis is conducted to identify correlations and causal

relationships between two or more variables. It also aids in making predictions related to examining the determinants of cocoyam market commercialization.

OLS regression analysis provides several advantages, including the ability to control for confounding factors, evaluate the combined impact of multiple variables, and determine the relative importance of independent variables in explaining the dependent variable. However, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations, such as the need for high-quality data, the potential presence of multicollinearity (high intercorrelation) among independent variables, and adherence to assumptions for reliable results. Researchers such as Gulden and Nese (2013) and Piyal *et al.* (2021) differentiate between univariate regression analysis, which involves a single independent variable, and multivariate regression analysis, which incorporates two or more independent variables. In OLS regression analysis, an attempt is made to simultaneously account for the variations of the independent variables in the dependent variable, commonly reported as the coefficient of multiple determination (R²) (Gulden and Nese, 2013). Alexopoulos (2010) adds that the primary objective of OLS is to predict the dependent variable (*Y*) based on the independent variable (*X*) or describe how *Y* is influenced by *X* (through a regression line or curve).

The simple OLS regression analysis model adapted from Srinidhi *et al.* (2011); Adam and Estevez (2021) is defined by:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon$$

Where: *i* = n observation

Y_i = dependent variable

X_i = explanatory variables

β_0 = Y-intercept (constant term)

β_p = slope coefficient for each explanatory variable

ε = the model's error term (also known as the residuals).

Summary of Data

Table 2 presents an overview of the variables utilized in the study to achieve the research objectives, facilitating the formation of a sound conclusion. The standard deviation of 0.50 is indicative of the level of variability for the variables: sex, marital status, cooperative

membership, and access to credit. According to Obianefoet *al.* (2021), a standard deviation exceeding 0.49 is considered significant in demonstrating the variability of farmers' responses, thus aiding decision-making. The mean age of the cocoyam farmers examined in this study was approximately 41 years, indicating that they are in the prime stage of their productive lives. Uchembaet *al.* (2021) observed that younger farmers tend to be more risk-averse. Additionally, the average farming experience of 18.94 suggests that cocoyam farmers have dedicated over a decade to this enterprise, which enables them to grasp the fundamental principles of cocoyam production. This finding aligns with Nwafor's (2021) discovery that a significant proportion (36%) of respondents had experience ranging from 11 to 20 years in cocoyam production. The average household size of 6.69 approximately means that each household is represented by 7 people in the study area. This number of people in farmer's households is high enough to support cheap family labour in the agricultural sector. On average, the cocoyam producers included in the study had approximately 1.92 extension contacts, indicating that each producer had around 2 interactions with extension advisors to enhance their production knowledge and experience.

Table 2: Summary of data included in the analysis

| Variables | Mean | Standard deviation |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Sex (dummy; 0 = female, 1 = male) | 0.48 | 0.50 |
| Age (year) | 41.24 | 10.55 |
| Marital status (dummy; 0 = single, 1 = married) | 0.44 | 0.50 |
| Years of formal education (year) | 10.48 | 6.81 |
| Farming experience (year) | 18.94 | 7.19 |
| Household size (Number of people) | 6.69 | 3.57 |
| Cooperative membership (dummy; 0 = no, 1 = yes) | 0.49 | 0.50 |
| Extension contacts (Number) | 1.92 | 1.51 |
| Farm size (ha) | 0.186 | 0.098 |
| Cocoyam produced (kg) | 4166.1 | 991.2 |
| Cocoyam sold (kg) | 2817.7 | 978.0 |
| Selling price (USD) | 0.41 | 0.25 |
| Access to credit | 0.51 | 0.50 |
| Revenue (USD) | 84,749.89 | 34701.02 |

Source: Field survey, 2023.

The study revealed that the average farm size, measured in hectares (ha), was 0.186 ha for cocoyam production. This indicates that cocoyam production in the study area is predominantly undertaken by marginalized farmers who may not own the land on which they


cultivate cocoyam for commercial purposes. Marginalized land ownership can contribute to food insecurity as these farmers have limited access to land and resources, making it challenging for them to produce an adequate supply of food for themselves and their communities (Botreau and Cohen, 2020). Furthermore, the study found that the total amount of cocoyam produced was 4166.1 kg, while the quantity sold was 2817.7 kg. This trade volume helps estimate the level of farmers' participation and commercialization in the sector, as defined by Gebre *et al.* (2021) as the proportion of products offered for sale by the farmers. Lastly, the average selling price per kilogram was 0.41 USD. By calculating the total amount of goods offered for sale and multiplying it by the average selling price, the study determined that the average revenue generated was 1,167.5 USD.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Result Presentation

4.1. Ascertaining conditions marketing

The findings the market



the market for cocoyam

regarding conditions

for cocoyam marketing are displayed in Figure 1 and Table 3.

Figure 1: Lorenz curve of income inequality

Table 3: Result of the Gini coefficient of smallholder cocoyam production/marketing

| Income | Number of farmers | Proportion of farmers (X_i) | Proportion of Sales | Cumm. Sales (Y_i) | $X_i Y_i$ |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 1,444,740 | 20 | 0.054 | 0.046 | 0.046 | 0.003 |
| 2,987,990 | 33 | 0.090 | 0.096 | 0.142 | 0.013 |
| 957,920 | 12 | 0.033 | 0.031 | 0.173 | 0.006 |
| 5,394,170 | 59 | 0.160 | 0.173 | 0.346 | 0.055 |
| 7,887,980 | 92 | 0.250 | 0.253 | 0.599 | 0.150 |
| 12,515,160 | 152 | 0.413 | 0.401 | 1 | 0.413 |
| 31,187,960 | 368 | 1 | 1 | | 0.639 |

$GC = 1 - \sum X_i Y_i: 1 - 0.639 = 0.361$

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The total income for the 368 smallholder cocoyam farmers was ₦31,187,960 at N700/USD, which equated to 44,554.23 USD. The Gini Coefficient value was calculated as 0.361. From the Lorenz Curve, it is closer to the line of equality.

4.2. Identifying the commercialization index of the cocoyam commodity

Table 4 presents the extent of commercialization within the cocoyam market.

Table 4: The commercialization index of the cocoyam commodity

| Items | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|----------------------|------------------|
| 0 - 0.49 (Low commercialization) | 64 | 17.4 |
| 0.50 - 0.69 (Moderate commercialization) | 134 | 36.4 |
| 0.70 - 1.00 (High commercialization) | 170 | 46.2 |
| Total | 368 | 100 |
| | Produced (kg) | Sold (kg) |
| Min | 2516.0 | 1084.5 |
| Max | 5983.0 | 5562.3 |
| Mean | 4166.1 | 2817.7 |
| Std. Dev | 991.2 | 978.0 |

Commercialization index

0.68

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The Table shows that the minimum cocoyam production was 2516.0 kg, with a corresponding 1084.5 kg offered for sale. On the other hand, the maximum production reached was 5983.0 kg, with a maximum volume offered to the market of 5562.3 kg. These results reveal a farmers' market participation index or commercialization value of 0.68 (68.0%). The researchers further discovered that a greater proportion (46.2%) of the farmers exhibited a high commercialization index ranging from 0.70 to 1.00, while an additional 36.4% had a moderate commercialization index ranging from 0.50 to 0.69. The remaining 17.4% demonstrate a low commercialization index of 0.00 to 0.49.

4.3. The determinants of farmers' participation in the commercialization of the cocoyam commodity

The determinants of commercialization in the cocoyam market were analyzed using ordinary least square regression through the utilization of R software. The findings from this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Determinants of farmers' participation in the commodity commercialization

| Commercialization index | B | Std. Error | Beta | t-stat. |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Constant | 97.777 | 2.090 | | 46.78 |
| Sex | 6.293 | 0.548 | 0.354 | 11.48*** |
| Age | 0.012 | 0.026 | 0.014 | 0.46 |
| Marital status | 4.932 | 0.549 | 0.275 | 8.98*** |
| Education | -0.523 | 0.041 | -0.400 | -12.89*** |
| Farming experience | 0.072 | 0.039 | 0.058 | 1.87* |
| Household size | -0.222 | 0.079 | -0.089 | -2.82** |
| Cooperative membership | 2.635 | 0.548 | 0.148 | 4.81*** |
| Extension contacts | -2.167 | 0.187 | -0.368 | -11.60*** |
| Farm size | -0.097 | 0.186 | -0.016 | -0.52 |
| Unit selling price | -0.002 | 0.002 | -0.046 | -1.49 |
| Access to credit | -3.932 | 0.548 | -0.221 | -7.18*** |
| | | 66.74*** | | |
| F-stat. | | | 0.673 | |
| R ² | | | | |
| Adjusted R ² | | | 0.663 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023. * (Sig. @ 10%), ** (Sig. @ 5%), and * (Sig. @ 1%)**

In terms of diagnostic evaluation, the F-statistics value of 66.74 was found to be highly significant at a 1% (***) level of probability. This indicates that, among the variables included in the model, at least one of them significantly influences farmers' decision to participate in cocoyam commercialization in the area. Therefore, the initial assumption that the socioeconomic characteristics of respondents do not impact cocoyam commercialization was rejected, given the significance of the identified variables.

Given the significant F-statistics value, it can be inferred that the selected model is well-fitted to explain the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, as suggested by Shah *et al.* (2022). Moreover, considering the substantial number of explanatory variables included in the study, the adjusted R^2 appears to be more appropriate for interpretation. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.663 indicates that farmers' socioeconomic characteristics account for approximately 66.3% of the variation in their decision to participate in the cocoyam commercialization project. The remaining 33.7% of unexplained variation may be attributed to external factors beyond the farmers' control, such as competition, inflation, pests and diseases affecting yield, soil fertility, product quality, and climate change effects, among others (Ariyo et al., 2021). For a more accurate result, the standardized coefficient (Beta) value was used in the reporting.

The coefficients for sex (0.354), marital status (0.549), and cooperative membership (0.548) were found to be positively and statistically significant at a 1% level of probability. This indicates that an additional male cocoyam farmer is associated with a 0.354 unit increase in the decision to engage in commercialization. Again, the results indicate that an increase in the number of married cocoyam farmers by one is associated with a 0.549 unit increase in their decision to engage in commercialization. Additionally, an increase in the number of farmers belonging to a cooperative group is associated with a 0.548 unit increase in their decision to engage in commercialization.

The coefficients for education (0.041), extension contacts (0.187), and access to credit (0.548) were found to be statistically significant at a 1% level of probability and negatively associated with the decision to engage in cocoyam commercialization. This implies that an increase in the

number of years of education or the presence of more educated farmers in the study is associated with a 0.041 unit decrease in the likelihood of farmers engaging in cocoyam commercialization. Contrary to the initial expectations, an increase in the number of extension contacts is associated with a 0.187 unit decrease in the decision to engage in cocoyam commercialization. Furthermore, an increase in the number of farmers with access to formal credit is associated with a decrease in the decision to engage in cocoyam commercialization.

The coefficient for farming experience (0.039) was found to be positive and statistically significant at a 10% level of probability. This suggests that an increase in the number of years farmers have been involved in cocoyam production by one unit will lead to a 0.039 unit increase in their likelihood of participating in cocoyam commercialization.

Additionally, the coefficient for household size (0.079) was found to be negative and statistically significant at a 5% level of probability. This implies that a unit increase in the number of household members will lead to a 0.079-unit reduction in cocoyam commercialization.

In summary, the study identified several determinants of the commercialization decision in the cocoyam market, including gender, marital status, level of education, farming experience, household size, cooperative membership, extension contacts, and access to credit. These factors collectively influence farmers' decisions regarding their involvement in cocoyam commercialization.

4.4 Profitability of smallholder's cocoyam production/marketing

The profitability analysis of smallholder cocoyam production and marketing is outlined in Table 6.

Table 6: Profitability of smallholder's cocoyam production/marketing

| Description of variables | SI unit | Quantity | Unit price/cost/unit (USD) | Cost/Value (USD) | Percentage |
|---------------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Sales Revenue (A): | | | | | |
| Yield | Kg | 2818 | 0.41 | 1,167.5 | |
| Physical cost | | | | | |
| Cocoyam sett | Kg | 315 | 0.41 | 130.3 | |
| Fertilizer | Kg | 204 | 0.43 | 87.5 | |
| Herbicide | Liter | 1 | 5.14 | 6.4 | |
| Organic manure | Kg | 263 | 0.07 | 18.8 | |
| Transportation | N | | | 9.3 | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|------|---------------|------|
| Total | | | | 252.3 | 72.1 |
| Labour: | | | | | |
| Landpreparation | Man-day | 6 | 3.14 | 18.6 | |
| Planting | Man-day | 2 | 4.57 | 10.2 | |
| Fertilizer application | Man-day | 4 | 2.00 | 7.1 | |
| Hand weeding | Man-day | 4 | 3.00 | 11.1 | |
| Harvesting | Man-day | 3 | 3.00 | 9.0 | |
| Total labour | | | | 56.0 | 16.0 |
| Total variable cost (TVC) (B) | | | | 308.25 | |
| Gross profit before salary (C: A – B) | | | | 859.21 | |
| Less 20% of C as salary | | | | 171.84 | |
| Profit after salary (D) | | | | 687.36 | |
| Dep. on fixed assets excluding land | | | | 41.43 | 11.8 |
| Tot cost (TC) | | | | 349.68 | |
| Net returns (NR) | | | | 645.94 | |
| Profitability ratio (GM/TVC) | | | | 0.74 | |
| ROI (NR/TC) | | | | 1.85 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023. Note: N700/1 USD

Cocoyam sales generated a revenue of 1,167.5 USD. Input expenses totaled 252.3 USD, accounting for 72.1% of the entire cost. Labour costs amounted to 56.0 USD, which is 16.0% of the whole production/marketing cost, bringing the overall operating cost to 308.25 USD. The gross profit from cocoyam sales stood at 859.21 USD. This aligns with findings by Enibeet *al.* (2019) and Nwankwo *et al.* (2023), suggesting that the cocoyam business is lucrative, particularly with international (AfCTA) potential.

Roughly 20% (171.84 USD) of the gross profit was earmarked for salary, resulting in an actual profit of 687.36 USD. Additionally, the depreciated asset value came to 41.43 USD or 11.8% of the total expenses. The net earnings from this endeavour amounted to 645.94 USD. The Tables show a profitability ratio of 0.74 and a return on investment (ROI) value of 1.85.

4.5 Determinants of smallholder cocoyam farmers' profitability

The determinants of smallholder cocoyam farmers' profitability are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Determinants of smallholder cocoyam farmers' profitability

| <i>Profit variables</i> | <i>Coefficient</i> | <i>Standard Error</i> | <i>t Stat</i> | <i>Confidence interval (CI) for:</i> | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | | <i>Lower 95%</i> | <i>Upper 95%</i> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|
| Intercept | 634.939 | 17.567 | 36.14 | 600.391 | 669.486 |
| Sex | 90.285 | 5.489 | 16.45*** | 79.490 | 101.079 |
| Age | -1.473 | 0.260 | -5.67*** | -1.983 | -0.962 |
| Marital status | -6.497 | 5.492 | -1.18 | -17.298 | 4.304 |
| Level of education | -1.909 | 0.406 | -4.70*** | -2.709 | -1.110 |
| Farming experience | 1.780 | 0.389 | 4.58*** | 1.016 | 2.545 |
| Household size | 0.283 | 0.788 | 0.36 | -1.268 | 1.833 |
| Cooperative membership | -71.857 | 5.490 | -13.09*** | -82.653 | -61.060 |
| Number of extensions contact | 12.135 | 1.872 | 6.48*** | 8.454 | 15.816 |
| Farm size | -4.820 | 1.857 | -2.60** | -8.473 | -1.167 |
| Access to credit | -3.673 | 5.488 | -0.67 | -14.465 | 7.119 |
| F-statistics | | | 53.68*** | | |
| R-square | | | 0.601 | | |
| Obs. | | | 368 | | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023. * (Sig. @ 10%), ** (Sig. @ 5%), and * (Sig. @ 1%)**

The ordinary least square regression analysis produced an F-statistics value of 53.68*** which is significant at a 1% level of probability. The analysis returned an R-square value of 0.601, indicating that the selected explanatory variables explained 60.1% of the profit, while the remaining 39.9% unexplained is a result of the error beyond the control of the farmers.

The coefficient associated with sex was positive and significant at a 1% level of probability. This suggests that a marginal increase in the number of male farmers involved in the cocoyam farming activity will result in a profit increase of 90.285 USD. Analyzing the 95% confidence interval (CI) as presented in Table 7, it can be inferred that smallholder farmers are currently earning a profit that is 10.794 USD lower than their maximum attainable profit of 101.079 USD.

The coefficient of age was negative and significant at a 1% level of probability, this implies that an additional one-year increase in the age of farmers will reduce their profit from smallholder cocoyam production by 1.473 USD. The researcher(s) also observed that from the 95% CI, the minimum reduction in profit expected from the farmers was 1.983 USD, this value was not exceeded as the farmers are 0.510 USD slightly above their minimal reduction point.

The relationship between education and profit, based on the coefficient, was negative and statistically significant at the 1% significance level. This means that for each additional educational qualification obtained by the farmers, there is a corresponding decrease in profit

from cocoyam production by 1.909 USD. From a 95% confidence interval perspective, the farmers' profit is 0.800 USD above the lower acceptable profit margin of 2.709 USD.

The relationship between the farming experience and profit realized from smallholder cocoyam farming is positive and significant at a 1% significance level. This indicates that with each year of added farming experience, there is a profit increment of 1.780 USD. As per Table 7, farmers have not reached the anticipated peak profit gain of 2.545 USD.

Furthermore, the effect of cooperative membership on profit was negative and significant at a 1% significance level. This suggests that as the number of smallholder farmers outside cooperative societies grows, the profit from the venture declines by 71.857 USD.

The coefficient for the number of extension contacts was positive and statistically significant at a 1% level of significance. This suggests that a marginal increase in the number of extension contacts available to smallholder cocoyam farmers will result in an increase in their profit by 12.135 USD. However, the farmers have not yet achieved the optimal profit margin of 15.816 USD as indicated by a 95% confidence interval. Lastly, there is a negative and significant relationship between the farm size and profit at a 5% level of significance, indicating that an increase in farm size will reduce the farmers' profit by 4.820 USD. Merely increasing farmers' access to land, without considering mechanization, will not lead to a meaningful impact, as suggested by Garzón Delvaux *et al.* (2020).

4.6 Challenges to cocoyam production/marketing

The challenges faced by smallholder cocoyam farmers in both farming and marketing are illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Challenges to smallholder cocoyam production/ marketing

Based on the data visualized from fieldwork, the researchers found that farmers are faced with multiple challenges. Notably, a significant majority (91.0%) of the farmers struggle with inadequate capital. Furthermore, 89.0% of the farmers reported inadequate access to improved cocoyam cultivars.

Other significant challenges include bad roads (81.0%), storage facilities (79.0%), and the distance to markets (68.0%). Additional challenges identified in the study include the high cost of labour (56.0%), lack of value chain experience (55.0%), high cost of farm input (54.0%), lack of structured market (53.0%), and high cost of transportation (50.0%).

4.7 Discussions

The goal of this study was to analyze sustainable market conditions and determinants influencing farmers' involvement in the commercialization of cocoyam in Anambra State, Nigeria. The study adopted the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve approach suggested by Sitthiyot and Holasut (2021) to eliminate the need for error minimization techniques in estimating the curve. Using this method, Park and Kim (2021) noted that a greater distance between the Lorenz curve and the line of perfect equality indicates higher income or wealth inequality. The results showed that the cocoyam market was relatively equitable, with a Gini

coefficient of 0.361, indicating a low level of income inequality among smallholder cocoyam farmers. Cocoyam production and sales are not heavily concentrated in the hands of a few individuals. With a Gini coefficient below 0.5, which is considered close to perfect competition according to Nsikanet *et al.* (2013), it is likely that the organization of farmers into a strong group, such as a farmers' cooperative, has enhanced their bargaining power, facilitated access to markets and resources for small-scale farmers, and promoted a fairer distribution of income (Gona *et al.*, 2020). This result confirms that smallholder farmers are prepared to participate in the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCTA) sustainably. This finding represents a better improvement compared to the 0.564 reported by Nwankwo *et al.* (2023) in their study in Southeast, Nigeria.

The results also revealed that cocoyam farmers had a high degree of commercialization, with an average market participation index of 0.68, indicating that they sold 68% of their cocoyam production. This supports the assumption of Ukwuet *et al.* (2022), who noted that the demand for cocoyam is expanding both domestically and internationally due to its nutritional value and versatility in various culinary applications. However, the commercialization value of 0.68 is lower than the 0.77 reported in the work of Ogundele (2020) for Nigerian small-scale farmers. Nonetheless, the fact that 68.0% of cocoyam production was offered for sale in Anambra State indicates that cocoyam production is not primarily for household consumption. This result convincingly demonstrates that farmers in the area possess a fair market orientation, promoting increased market participation.

Among the determinants of cocoyam commercialization, it was found that male farmers exhibit a stronger market orientation compared to their female counterparts. This aligns with the assertion of Mkandawire *et al.* (2022), who argued that historically, men have played significant roles in agricultural production, income generation, and decision-making within households. The statistical significance and positive influence of marital status align with previous studies by Obianefo, Ezeano, Okoroji, and Offiah (2022), as well as Uchembaet *et al.* (2021), who suggested that marriage brings additional responsibilities, motivating married farmers to increase the quantity of their farm produce offered for sale to meet family demands. This study also agrees with Mukaila *et al.* (2022), who found a positive relationship between cocoyam farmers' participation index and cooperative membership. Furthermore, farming experience plays a vital role in enhancing farmers' knowledge, resource management skills, adaptation to local

conditions, market understanding, and risk management capabilities. It equips them to meet market demands and increases their chances of success in cocoyam commercialization (Hussaynet *al.*, 2020). Contrarily, a negative relationship between household size and commercialization aligns with the report of Nwafor (2021), who suggested that farmers with large family sizes allocate a significant portion of their farm produce for household consumption before considering what can be offered for sale. This information highlighted the importance of market orientation, gender dynamics, household characteristics, and collective action in shaping farmers' market behaviour and commercial success among other factors.

Despite the high operating expenses, the farmers still achieved a profit margin of 74.0%, which falls short of the 80.0% observed by Fadipeet *al.* (2015). However, this 74.0% confirms the assertions made by Enibeet *al.* (2019) and Nwankwo *et al.* (2023) regarding the lucrative nature of the cocoyam business, particularly with its international potential. The return on investment (ROI) value of 1.85 is lower than the 3.17 reported by Ridwan and colleagues (2022). This suggests a need for improvement to maximize output, especially considering the comparative advantage that the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCTA) will bring. From the determinants, sex, age, level of education, farming experience, cooperative membership, number of extension contacts, and farm size were identified, which largely align with the findings of Ezeano *et al.* (2017); Afolami and Ogungbenro (2017) and Anyiam and colleagues (2023) who reported similar variables. However, identifying these determinants is crucial for understanding their impact on profitability in cocoyam farming. For example, factors like farming experience, cooperative membership, and access to extension services positively influence farmers' knowledge, skills, and access to resources, which leads to increased profitability. Though Garzón Delvaux *et al.* (2020) noted that merely increasing farmers' access to land, without considering mechanization, will not lead to a meaningful impact, this area must be looked into. On the other hand, age and level of education may also play a role, with older farmers potentially having more experience but possibly facing challenges adapting to new market dynamics, while higher education levels might lead to better decision-making but could also introduce higher costs.

Finally, as stated by Fadipeet *al.* (2015) and Wilcox *et al.* (2016), the lack of capital makes it difficult for farmers to purchase essential inputs such as high-quality seeds, fertilizers,

and pesticides, compromising both yield and cocoyam quality. Unfortunately, the predominant cultivars available to farmers are native types, which are particularly vulnerable to pests, diseases, and climate change. This finding is consistent with Ifeanyi-Obi et al. (2017); Ariyo et al. (2021). Moreover, Ijioma et al. (2014) argue that if farmers cannot transport their produce to urban markets where demand is highest, they may face reduced profits due to a supply glut at the farm gate. Thus, addressing these issues is crucial if farmers aim to transition from smallholder status to medium-scale operations in the long term.

5.1 Conclusion

The conclusion written from this study has consequences for both policy and practice in the agricultural sector, particularly in Anambra State, Nigeria. By analyzing sustainable market conditions and identifying determinants influencing farmers' involvement in cocoyam commercialization, the study offers valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities facing smallholder farmers and their ability to participate in the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCTA).

In the first instance, the findings regarding market conditions, as indicated by a Gini Coefficient value of 0.361 and a 68.0% commercialization index, uncovered the importance of farmers' market orientation and negotiation skills. This revealed smallholder farmers' ability to engage effectively in commercial activities, which is crucial for their economic sustainability and livelihood improvement.

Furthermore, the study threw its weight on the financial implication of cocoyam farming, exposing that farmers allocate a significant portion (20%) of their profits to salary, which will help to improve their agribusiness sense and recapitalization. The recorded return on investment of 1.85 USD for every 1 USD invested demonstrates the profitability potential of cocoyam farming, which can motivate further investment and expansion in the sector.

Additionally, the identification of key determinants influencing commercialization index and profitability, such as sex, level of education, farming experience, cooperative membership, and extension contacts, provides actionable insights for policymakers and agricultural

stakeholders. By addressing these determinants through targeted interventions and support programs, policymakers can promote inclusive growth and sustainable development in the agricultural sector.

Moreover, the study pointed to several challenges faced by smallholder cocoyam farmers, including inadequate capital, poor infrastructure, high cost of labour, and lack of structured markets. Addressing these challenges is essential for enhancing farmers' productivity, market access, and overall well-being.

However, these findings will serve as a valuable resource for informing policy decisions, guiding agricultural development initiatives, and promoting the economic empowerment of smallholder farmers in Anambra State in particular and Nigeria in Nigeria. The study presents the need to address market constraints, improve access to resources, and enhance farmers' capacity to capitalize on emerging opportunities in the agricultural value chain.

5.2 Limitations of the Study:

With financial constraints in mind, expanding the sample size to include more than 368 smallholder farmers across additional Local Government Areas could have provided a broader spatial and locational scope for the study. This expansion would have enhanced the potential for generalizing the findings to the entirety of Anambra State.

5.3 Recommendations:

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. The government and policymakers should introduce programs aimed at enhancing farmers' access to affordable credit and financial resources. This would alleviate constraints related to inadequate capital, enabling farmers to expand their markets and adopt innovative methods to scale up production and improve marketing capacity.
2. To enhance agriculture in Anambra State, the government should invest in improving rural infrastructure, including roads, transportation networks, and storage facilities. By reducing transportation costs and minimizing post-harvest losses, these improvements would increase the profitability of smallholder farmers.

5.4 Recommendation for Further Study:

There is a need for other scholars to take up study to investigate the relationship between commercialization, income, food security, and poverty reduction among cocoyam farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria.

References:

- Abdullah, F.R., Riaz, A., Sajjad, A., Abbas, A.C., Waqar, A., Aasir, I., & Izhar, U.D. (2019). Determinants of commercialization and its impact on the welfare of smallholder rice farmers by using Heckman's two-stage approach. *Journal of the Saudi Society of Agricultural Sciences*, 18(2): 224-233.
- Adam, H. & Estevez, E. (2021). Corporate finance and accounting: Financial analysis. Investopedia. Accessed 27 August 2021: <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/mlr.asp>
- Adeyanju, J.A., Babarinde, G.O., Abioye, A.O., Olajire, A.S., & Bolarinwa, I.D. (2019). Cocoyam Processing: Food Uses and Industrial Benefits. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 10(9): 151-169.
- Afolami, C.A. & Ogunbenro, I.B. (2017). Profit Efficiency of Smallholder Cocoyam based Farmers and its Determinants in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Environment*, 18(1 & 2):36-46.
- Aigheyisi, O. S., & Iyoha, M. A. (2022). are staff of the Department of Economics, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Central Bank of Nigeria. *Economic and Financial Review*, 60(1): 25-51.
- Alexopoulos, E. C. (2010). Introduction to multivariate regression analysis. *Hippokratia*, 14(1): 23-28.
- Anumudu, O.O., Obianefo, C.A., Okafor, I.P. & Onyekineso, J.C. (2020). Determinants Of Market Participation and Failure of Table Egg Production by Small Scale Poultry Farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Sciences and Research*, 76(1): 58-77.
- Anyiam, K.H., Uhuegbulem, I.J., Obi-Nwandikom, C.O., Ibeagwa, O.B., Okwara, M.O., Eze, J.A. & Nwokedimkpa, P.E. (2023). Economics of cocoyam production in orsu local government area, Imo State, Nigeria. *The International Journal of Agriculture, Management and Technology*, 7(1): 557-565.
- Ariyo, O.C., Usman, M.B., Olagunju, O.E., Oluyemisi, A.M., & Ademuwagun, A.A. (2021). Determinants Of Inputs-Output Relationship of Yam Production in Gboyin Local Government Area of Ekiti State, Nigeria. *RJOAS*, 3(111): 100-108.

- Bedru, B.B, & Motunrayo, A.O (2022). Agricultural credit constraints in smallholder farming in developing countries: Evidence from Nigeria. *World Development Sustainability*, 1; 100012, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2022.100012>.
- Boakye, A. A., Wireko-Manu, F. D., Oduro, I., Ellis, W. O., Gudjónsdóttir, M., & Chronakis, I. S. (2018). Utilizing cocoyam (*Xanthosoma sagittifolium*) for food and nutrition security: A review. *Food science & nutrition*, 6(4), 703–713. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.602>
- Boakye-Achampong, S., Ohene-Yankyera, K., Aidoo, R., & Sørensen, O. J. (2017). Is there any economics in smallholder cocoyam production? Evidence from the forest agro-ecological zone of Ghana. *Agriculture & Food Security*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-017-0121-9>
- Botreau, H., & Cohen, M. J. (2020). Gender inequality and food insecurity: A dozen years after the food price crisis, rural women still bear the brunt of poverty and hunger. *In Advances in food security and sustainability* (pp. 53–117). <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.af2s.2020.09.001>
- Climate data (2021) Climate-Data-org. Retrieved March 22 2021 from <https://en.climate-data.org/africa/nigeria/anambra/awka-46675/>
- Coronell-Tovar, D.C., Chávez-Jáuregui, R.N., Ángel, B., & López-Moreno, M.L. (2019). Characterization of cocoyam (*Xanthosoma* spp.) Corm flour from the Nazareno cultivar. *Food Sci. Technol, Campinas*, 39(2): 349-357.
- Davies, A.E. (2009). Food security initiatives in Nigeria Prospect and challenges. *Journal of sustainable development in Africa*, 11(1): 186-202.
- Enibe, D. O. Nwobodo, E.C., Nworji, M. J. & Okonkwo, C. A. (2019). Economic Analysis of Cocoyam Marketing in Anambra Agricultural Zone of Anambra State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 29(3); 1-10.
- Eyasu, W., Tileye, F. and Kassahun, T. (2019). Proximate, Mineral and Antinutrient Contents of Cocoyam (*Xanthosoma sagittifolium* (L.) Schott) from Ethiopia. *International Journal of Food Science*, 2019, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/8965476>
- Ezeano, C. I., Okeke, C. C., Onwusika, A. I. & Obiekwe, N. J. (2017). Determinants Of Cocoyam Production and Profitability Small Holder Farmers in South East Of Nigeria. *Life Science Archives*, 3(3): 1060-1072.
- Fadipe, A. E. A., Adenuga, A. H. & Raji, U. A. (2015). Analysis of Cocoyam Marketing in Sagamu Local Government Area, Ogun State, Nigeria. *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 3; 208-213.
- FAO. 2017. The future of food and agriculture – Trends and challenges. Rome
- Garson, D. 2009. Logistic regression with SPSS. North Carolina State University, Public Administration Program.

- Garzón Delvaux, P. A., Riesgo, L., & Gomez Y Paloma, S. (2020). Are small farms more performant than larger ones in developing countries? *Science advances*, 6(41), eabb8235. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb8235>
- Gbigbi, T. M. (2018). Research Paper Economics and Profitability Analysis of Cocoyam Production In Delta State, Nigeria. Available online: <https://oa.mg/work/2947113362>
- Gebre, E., Workiye, A., and Haile, K. (2021). Determinants of sorghum crop commercialization: the case of Southwest Ethiopia. *Heliyon*, 7(7): e07453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07453>
- Giller, K.E., Delaune, T., Silva, J.V. et al. Small farms and development in sub-Saharan Africa: Farming for food, for income or for lack of better options? *Food Science*, 13, 1431–1454 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-021-01209-0>
- Gona, A., Khalid, A. &Maikasuwa, M. A. (2020). Structure, Conduct, and Performance of Rice Marketing in Kebbi State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Research*, 8(2): 1-11.
- Govere, J., Jayne, T.S., Nyoro, J. (1999). Smallholder Commercialization, Interlinked Markets, and Food Crop Productivity: Cross-Country Evidence in Eastern and Southern Africa. http://www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/ag_transformation/atw_govere.PDF
- Gulden, K.U. & Nese G. (2013). A study on multiple linear regression analysis. *Procedia Social Science and Behavioral Science*, 106(13): 234-240.
- Hussayn, J.A., Gulak, D.M., Aboaba, K.O. &Keshinro, O.O. (2020). Effects of Agricultural Commercialization on Poverty Status of Smallholder Cassava Farming Households in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*, 20(4): 255-266.
- Ifeanyi-obi, C. C., Adesope, O. M., Issa, F. O. &Ugwuja, V. C. (2013). Organic Agriculture as Resuscitating Option for Cocoyam Production in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Research and Technology*, 2(6): 196 – 202.
- Ifeanyi-Obi, C.C., Togun, A.O., Lamboll, R., Adesope, O.M. and Arokoyu, S.B. (2017). Challenges faced by cocoyam farmers in adapting to climate change in Southeast Nigeria. *Climate Risk Management*, 17(2017): 55-64.
- Ijioma, J.C., Effiong, J.B., Ogbonna, M.O. &Onwuamaoka, E A. (2014). Determinants of Adoption of Selected NRCRI Cocoyam Technologies among Farmers in Umuahia South Local Government Area of Abia State, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(6): 181-189.
- Ismail, F. (2019). Inclusivity and the Transformational Potentials of the African Continental Free Trade Area (ACFTA) for African Countries. Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Founders Day Lecture 26th March, 2019, University of Lagos, Nigeria.
- Jung, I. (2023). Food Insecurity in Nigeria: Food Supply Matters: Nigeria. Selected Issues Papers, 2023(018), A001. Retrieved Feb 21, 2024, from <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400236921.018.A001>

- Kinkingninhoun, M.F.M, Komatsu, S., Mujawamariya, G. & Saito, K. (2020). Men and Women in Rice Farming in Africa: A Cross-Country Investigation of Labor and Its Determinants. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* 4:117. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2020.00117
- Kotchikpa, G.L. & Wendkouni, J.B.Z. (2016). Factors influencing smallholder crop commercialization: Evidence from Côte d'Ivoire. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 11(41): 4128-4140.
- Mamo, F.H. and Beguije, A.K. (2022). The Determinants of Commercialization to Smallholder Farmers in West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Region, Ethiopia. *Journal of World Economic Research*, 11(2): 64-76.
- Mkandawire, E., Bisai, C., Dyke, E., *et al.* (2022). A qualitative assessment of gender roles in child nutrition in Central Malawi. *BMC Public Health*, 22, 1392 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13749-x>.
- Moher, D., Schulz, K. F., Simera, I., & Altman, D. G. (2010). Guidance for Developers of Health Research Reporting Guidelines. *PLOS Medicine*, 7(2), e1000217. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000217>
- Mukaila, R., Falola, A., Awoyelu, F. E., Akanbi, S.-U. O., Chiemela, C. J., Ukwuaba, I. C., Ileka, C. M., & Erim, P. A. (2022). Profitability of Cocoyam Production and its Determinants in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Jordan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 18(4), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.35516/jjas.v18i4.78>
- Muthoni, J. & Shimelis, H. (2023). Minor root and tuber crops in Africa: Cocoyams (*Colocasia esculenta* and *Xanthosoma sagittifolium*). *Australian Journal of Crop Science*, 17(8):653-663, doi: 10.21475/ajcs.23.17.08.p3921.
- Nkeme, K.K., Ekanem, J.T. & Nse, V.A. (2021). Capacity building needs of small-holder cocoyam (*X. sagittifolium*) farmers in selected rural communities of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 25(2): 32-42.
- Nsikan, E.B., Out, W.I. & Aniekan, J.A. (2013). Rice Market Structure, Conduct and Performance in Nigeria: A Survey of Akwa Ibom State Rice Marketer. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Food Science*, 10(3): 102-111.
- Nwafor, C.U. (2021). Marketing channel preference among smallholder cocoyam farmers in South Africa. *Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development*, 62(4): 407–414. <https://doi.org/10.17306/J.JARD.2021.01507>
- Nwankwo, E. C., Okeke, U., Chiekezie, N. R., & Ozor, M. U. (2023). Determinants of Marketing Margin and Efficiency of Wholesale Marketing of Cocoyam in Southeast, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Research*, 11(1): 17-31.
- Nwankwo, E.C, Ugwumba, C.O.A, Chiekezie, N.R, Ozor, M.U. (2023). The Structure and Profitability of Wholesale Marketing of Cocoyam in Southeast, Nigeria. *Journal of Advance Research in Business Management and Accounting*, 9(6):28-38.

- Nzeh-Emeka, C., Akogwu, C. I., Ugwu, J. N., & Chika-Emeka, N. (2015). Cost-return analysis of cocoyam marketing in Nsukka agricultural zone of Enugu State, Nigeria. *Sky Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3(11): 215 – 222.
- Obianefo, C.A., Ezeano, I.C., Isibor, C.A. & Ahaneku, C.E. (2023). Technology Gap Efficiency of Small-Scale Rice Processors in Anambra State, Nigeria. *Sustainability*, 15, 4840. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064840>.
- Obianefo, C.A., Ezeano, I.C., Okoroji, N.O. & Offiah, E.O. (2022). Estimation of productivity yield gap contributions of climate change variability in selected horticultural crops (fresh maize and okra) in Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive*, 03(01), 016–030.
- Obianefo, C.A., Mailafia, L., Ismaila, Y. & Nwatu, C.B. (2022). Mediating Role of Entrepreneurship Development on the Economic Growth of Women in Nigeria. *The Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 43(1): 51-71.
- Obianefo, C.A., Uchemba, U.V., Ezeano, I.C. and Anumudu, O.O. (2021). Technical Efficiency and Technological Gap Ratios of Tomato Production in Northern Nigeria: A Stochastic Meta Frontier Approach. *The Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 42(1): 1-18.
- Ogundele, F. (2020). Factors influencing output commercialisation among small scale farmers in Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, 8(10): 001-009.
- Okafor, I.P. (2019). Effects of agricultural extension services on the performance of members of Women agricultural cooperatives in Southeast, Nigeria. A dissertation submitted to the Department of Cooperative Economics and Management Faculty of Management Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, pp: 1-193.
- Olayiwola, I.O., Folaranmi, F., Adebawale, A., Onabanjo, O.O., Sanni, S.A., et al. (2012) Nutritional Composition and Sensory Qualities of Cocoyam-Based Recipes Enriched with Cowpea Flour. *Journal of Nutrition and Food Science*, 2:170. doi:10.4172/2155-9600.1000170
- Omotesho K.F., Kayode A.O., Adebayo S.A., Akinrinde A.F. & Mohammed A.J. (2019). Cocoyam Commercialization Potentials in Oyun Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Tropical Agriculture, Food, Environment and Extension*, 19(3): 8 – 14.
- Opata, P.I. & Adeosun, K.P. (2016). Performance of Cocoyam Market Chain in South East Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(3): 192-203.
- Opata, P.I. (2018). Determinants of the Choice of Marketing Channel among Cocoyam Farmers in South East Nigeria. *The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences*, 28(4): 1142-1151.
- Opata, P.I., Adeosun, K.P. & Ozor, N.S. (2018). Unraveling Market Structure and Conduct of Cocoyam Industry in South East, Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(1): 33-44.

- Osalusi, C.S. & Oloba, O.G. (2018). Market Structure of Yam in Selected Market in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology*, 3(5): 1940-1942.
- Osmani, A.G., & Hossain, E. (2015). Market participation decision of smallholder farmers and its determinants in Bangladesh. *Journal OF Economics and Agriculture*, 62:163–179.
- Osuafor, O.O., Obianefo, C.A. & Dike, A.B. (2020). Food Security and Poverty Status of Cassava Processors in Awka North Local Government Area of Anambra State of Nigeria. *The Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 41(1): 1-16.
- Otekunrin, O. A., Sawicka, B., Adeyonu, A. G., Otekunrin, O. A., & Rachoń, L. (2021). Cocoyam [*Colocasia esculenta* (L.) Schott]: Exploring the Production, Health and Trade Potentials in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4483. MDPI AG. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su13084483>
- Otekunrin, O.A., Sawicka, B., Adeyonu, A.G. & Rachoń, L. (2021). Cocoyam [*Colocasia esculenta* (L.) Schott]: Exploring the Production, Health and Trade Potentials in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sustainability*, 13, 4483. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084483>
- Othuke, A. A. (2019). Nutritional and health benefits of cocoyam. Accessed on 10 July 2023, online: <https://dutable.com/2019/02/15/nutritional-and-health-benefits-of-cocoyam/>
- Owusu-Darko, P.G., Alistair, P. & Omenyo, E.L. (2014). Cocoyam (corms and cormels)—An underexploited food and feed resource. *Journal of Agricultural Chemistry and Environment*, 3(1): 22-29.
- Park, J. W., & Kim, C. U. (2021). Getting to a feasible income equality. *PloS one*, 16(3), e0249204. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249204>.
- Pawlak, K., & Kołodziejczak, M. (2020). The Role of Agriculture in Ensuring Food Security in Developing Countries: Considerations in the Context of the Problem of Sustainable Food Production. *Sustainability*, 12(13), 5488. MDPI AG. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su12135488>.
- Piyal, E., Lasini, W., Jeevani W. J. M. & Upaka R. (2021). Regression-Based Prediction of Power Generation at Samanalawewa Hydropower Plant in Sri Lanka Using Machine Learning. *Hindawi Mathematical Problem in Engineering*, 12 pages. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4913824>.
- Porter, G., Lyon, F. & Potts, D. (2007). Market institutions and urban food supply in West and Southern Africa: a review. *Progress in development studies*, 7(2): 115-134.
- Rahman, M. M., Tabash, M. I., Salamzadeh, A., Abdul, S., & Rahaman, M. S. (2022). Sampling Techniques (Probability) for Quantitative Social Science Researchers: A Conceptual Guidelines with Examples. *SEEU Review*, 17(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2022-0023>.
- Ridwan, A. F., Eluwande-Durojaye, F. A., Sheu-Usman, O.A., Jachinma, C.C., Ukwuaba, I.C., Chikaosolu, M.I. & Agbor, E.P. (2022). Profitability of Cocoyam Production and its

- Determinants in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Jordan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 18(4): 279-292.
- Shah, Z.A., M.A. Dar, E.A. Dar, C.A. Obianefo, A.H. Bhat, M.T. Ali, H.A. Alatawi, H.I. Ghamry, M. Shukry & Sayed, S. (2022). A multinomial approach to sustainable and improved agricultural technologies vis-a-vis socio-personal determinants in apple (*Malus domestica*) cultivation. *Journal of King Saud University - Science*, 34(7), 102286, doi.org/10.1016/j.jksus.2022.102286.
- Sharkdam, W. & Jamaludden, M.A. (2022). The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) and Regional Economic Integration: Prospects and Challenges. *Zamfara Journal of Politics and Development*, 3(1): 1-15.
- Silva, L.F.L.E., de Souza, D.C., Resende, L.V., Nassur, R.D.C.M., Samartini, C.Q., & Gonçalves, W.M. (2018). Nutritional Evaluation of Non-Conventional Vegetables in Brazil. *An. Acad. Bras. Cienc.*, 90, 1775–1787.
- Sitthiyot, T., & Holasut, K. A. (2021). Simple Method for Estimating the Lorenz Curve. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun*, 8, 268; <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00948-x>.
- Srinidhi, B., Gul, F. A., & Tsui, J. S. L. (2011). Female directors and earnings quality*. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 28(5), 1610–1644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1911-3846.2011.01071.x>
- Tariku, A., Dagnaygebaw, G. & Haile, T. (2021). Determinants of cereal crops commercialization among smallholder farmers in Guji Zone, Ethiopia, *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 7:1, 1948249, DOI: 10.1080/23311932.2021.1948249
- Temidayo, G.A., Ekeocha, A.H., Jaiyeoba, C., Igbalajobi, O., Oni, K., Bamigboye, O. & Bamisaye, S. (2021). Value Chain Analysis of Cocoyam Enterprise in Southwest Region, Nigeria. *Journal of the Austrian Society of Agricultural Economics*, 17(3):369-388.
- Uchemba, V.U., Nenna, G.M. & Obianefo, C.A. (2021). Adoption of Improved Cassava Production Technologies among Small-Scale Farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria. *Journal of Plant Science.*, 9, 119–127.
- Ukwu, C.P., Yahaya, A., Okere, P.C., Aladi, N.O., Odoemenam, V.U., Obikaonu, H.O., Uchegbu, M.C. & Okoli, I.C. (2022). The production, uses, nutritional and anti-nutritional characteristics of cocoyam as a potential feed ingredient in the tropics: A review. *Nigerian Journal of Animal Science*, 24(3): 91-111.
- Weinreb, C., Wolock, S. L., Tusi, B. K., Socolovsky, M., & Klein, A. M. (2018). Fundamental limits on dynamic inference from single-cell snapshots. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 115(10). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1714723115>.
- Wilcox, G. I., Ugwumba, C. O. A., Achike, A. I., Agbagwaa, C., & Uche, F.B. (2016). Allocative Efficiency of Smallholder Cocoyam Farmers in South-South, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology*, 1(4): 796-803.

- Winara, A., Fauziyah, E., Suhartono, Widiyanto, A., Sanudin, Sudomo, A., Siarudin, M., Hani, A., Indrajaya, Y., Achmad, B., et al. (2022). Assessing the Productivity and Socioeconomic Feasibility of Cocoyam and Teak Agroforestry for Food Security. *Sustainability*, 14, 11981. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141911981>.
- Zhao, H., Yao, X., Liu, Z. & Yang, Q. (2021). Impact of Pricing and Product Information on Consumer Buying Behavior with Customer Satisfaction in a Mediating Role. *Front. Psychol.* 12:720151. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.720151.

UNDER PEER REVIEW