

Short Research Article

Determinants of Poverty Status of Cassava-based farmers in Imo State, Nigeria.

Abstract

The study assessed the determinants of Poverty Status of Cassava based farmers in Imo State, specifically, it examines the socio-economic characteristics of cassava farmers and assessed the determinants of poverty status among cassava-based farmers in Imo state. Multistage and purposive sampling techniques were used in selecting sixty (60) cassava-based farmers in the three agricultural zones in the area. Data used for the study were obtained using structured questionnaire. The data obtained was were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Foster Greer Thorbecke (FGT) and ordered probit model. The result showed that the mean age was 50 years, 67% of the respondents are were women, 47% of the respondents have attended secondary education, they have 25 years mean farming experience, the mean household size was 6 persons, 88% of the farmers are married, and they have mean farm size of 1.03 hectare. The result of Foster Greer Thorbecke (FGT) analysis showed that the estimate of the poverty profile of cassava-based farmers in the study area was N62476.67k, the poverty incidence was 0.25, and the poverty depth and severity were 0.0659 and 0.0362 respectively. This implies that 6.59% of the total expenditure is required to close the poverty gap while in extreme cases additional 3.62% is was required to cross the poverty line. The ordered probit analysis showed that education, household size, farm income and extension contact were statistically significant at 1% and 5% probability levels, respectively. Findings revealed that education, household size, farm income and extension contact are were the significant determinants of farmers poverty status.

Keywords: Determinants, Poverty status, Cassava-based farmers, Imo State.

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is an unacceptable deprivation in human well-being comprising both physiological and social deprivation (World Bank, 2000; Etim *et al.*, 2013). According to Food and Agriculture

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

31 Organization (FAO 2005)), Poverty is a situation in which an individual lacks control over
32 economic resources, is unable to take part in the society and fails to meet up to a standard of
33 living generally accepted by a given society at a given period. Based on proper scrutiny
34 and understanding of various definitions and concepts of poverty, suffice it to say that,
35 poverty can be seen as the sum-total of all the factors, both social, psychological, physical,
36 economic and otherwise which affects and predisposes a particular set of people in the society
37 and makes them vulnerable to adverse conditions thereby making them live below the
38 generally accepted standard of living.

39 Poverty could be absolute or relative. Absolute poverty is a situation whereby a person cannot
40 afford to meet basic needs, similarly, relative poverty is when a person cannot afford to
41 meet up with his desires and wants, in other words, his resources (material, cultural and
42 social) are inadequate and exclude him from the minimum acceptable living standard of
43 the society in which he lives (Etim *et al*, 2013, Oduwole, 2015). The Food and Agriculture
44 Organization, FAO (2012) reported that close to 870 million people were suffering from
45 chronic undernourishment between the years 2010 and 2012 with the majority of them found in
46 developing countries of which Nigeria is inclusive. These global statistics of hunger and
47 undernourishment are shocking; subsequently, the need to eradicate hunger remains the major
48 global challenge confronting both developed and developing countries (olubukola et al., 2017).

49 | In Nigerian, the agricultural sector is characterized by intense poverty which is at an
50 increasing rate even though many policies have been formulated for its alleviation (Anger,
51 2010, Apata *et al*, 2010 and Etim *et al*, 2013). According to Etim *et al* (2013), the reasons
52 behind the pervasiveness of poverty in the Nigerian agricultural sector cannot be far-fetched.

Formatted: Highlight

53 | This is has been due to the fact that about 63% of rural dwellers mainly the poor engage in
54 subsistence farming on relatively small fragmented lands, have low access to infrastructures and
55 social amenities, inadequate access to modern technology, increasing population growth, poor
56 market and road network, high rate of illiteracy, poor storage facilities, etc. these challenges
57 militating crop production is undoubtedly the reason behind the insufficiency in food

Formatted: Highlight

58 | production and supply in the country resulting to abject hunger and poverty. This is in
59 line with the findings of Ibekwe *et al*,(2012) that the gap between food production rate
60 and food demand is continuously widening despite the fact that various programs have being

Formatted: Highlight

61 introduced by the government in order to increase food production, eradicate hunger and poverty
62 and also increase the standard of living of the populace.

63

64 Cassava (*Manihot esculenta*) as defined by the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
65 (IITA, 2015) is an herbaceous perennial woody shrub with an edible root, which grows in
66 tropical and subtropical areas of the world. It is a nutty-flavored starch-tuber that belongs to
67 the spurge family *Euphorbiaceae*. It is rich in carbohydrates, calcium, vitamins B and C, and
68 essential minerals. However, its nutrient composition differs according to variety, soil
69 conditions, climate, and other environmental factors during cultivation (IITA, 2015). Akpan
70 *et al.*, (2013) also reported that cassava is one of the popular and widely cultivated food crops
71 in the southern part of Nigeria. This could be as a result of its wide range of use and ability to
72 be processed into different products such as garri, fufu, dry cassava chips, cassava flour,
73 cassava starch, etc. its importance in the livelihood of rural poor and the developing country
74 like Nigeria cannot be overstated. Aside from satisfying the dietary needs of the greater part of
75 Nigeria population especially the rural poor, there is a record of increasing demand for cassava
76 as a raw material for manufacturing livestock feed, biofuel, pharmaceutical and textile
77 industries (Akpan *et al*, 2015). As result cassava has been considered as one of the preemptive
78 famine reserve crops in areas where rainfall is unpredictable, this gives it an advantage over
79 yam and other root and tuber crops in Africa most especially in Nigeria (Hendershot, 2004) as
80 reported by (olubukola *et al.*, 2017). Cassava production in Nigeria is on the increase with an
81 average yield of 10.6tonnes per hectare Ebong *et al* (2011) and Onubuogu *et al* (2014).
82 Although Cassava production and processing activities are widespread in the rural areas,
83 mostly done by the rural farmers; the proportion of smallholder farmers in Nigeria living in
84 poverty is on the increase (olubukola *et al.*, 2017). The principal roles of cassava in food
85 economy and its ability to survive drought and do well on poor soils have made it an important
86 food and cash crop which has the capability of reducing poverty especially among the rural
87 households that are mostly affected by poverty (Owusu and Donkor, 2012),. The relationship
88 between poverty and agriculture is essential because of the key role played by agriculture in
89 raising economic growth, improving productivity and income. Hence there is was a need for
90 sustainability of cassava production, food security and poverty reduction in Nigeria. This study
91 aims at assessing the determinants of Poverty Status of Cassava based farmers in Imo State,

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

92 specifically; it examines the socio-economic characteristics of cassava farmers and assesses the
93 determinants of poverty status among cassava-based farmers in Imo state.

94

95 **Materials and Methods**

96 The study was conducted in the three agricultural zones in Imo state which are Okigwe, Orlu and
97 Owerri. Imo state is situated in the South Eastern part of Nigeria. It consists of twenty seven
98 (27) local government areas (Obasi *et al*, 2015). Imo State lies within the latitude $4^{\circ} 45''\text{N}$
99 and $7^{\circ} 15''\text{N}$ and longitude $6^{\circ} 50''\text{E}$ and $7^{\circ} 25''\text{E}$ with land area of about $5,100\text{km}^2$
100 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2014). It is bordered by Abia state on the East, River Niger and
101 Delta state on the West, by Anambra State to the North and Rivers State to the South. It has an
102 annual rainfall varying from 1,500mm to 2,200mm, an average annual temperature above 20°C
103 and an annual relative humidity of 75% with humidity reaching 90% in rainy season (National
104 Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The estimated population is 4.8 million and the population
105 density varies from 230-1,400 people per square kilometer (National Bureau of Statistics, 2014).
106 The main occupation in Imo state is trading and agriculture (Obasi *et al*, 2015).
107 Most households cultivate food crops such as cassava, cocoyam, yam, maize, melon,
108 okra and vegetables (green, fluted pumpkin, water-leaf and bitter leaf), etc. and rear
109 livestock especially birds and goats (Obasi *et al*, 2015). The household are also involved in the
110 processing of some of these crops example; maize to corn meal, cassava to garri, fufu and
111 flour. The choice of using Imo State as a study area is because cassava is the predominant
112 crop in the area and is usually planted as a mixed or mono cropping.

113 Multistage and purposive sampling techniques were used to select households from which
114 socio-economic characteristics and the determinants of poverty status among cassava-based
115 farmers were carried out in the study area. In the first stage one local government area was
116 randomly selected from each of the three agricultural zones in the State. In the
117 second stage, two communities were randomly selected from each of the three local
118 government areas. In the third stage, one rural village was randomly selected from each of the
119 six communities making a total of six villages for the study. Finally, a total of ten farmers were
120 randomly selected from each of the village giving a sample size of sixty (60) respondents. The

121 study utilized primary data which was collected by use of structured questionnaire/focus-group
122 discussion method, while the secondary information were gotten from relevant literatures,
123 academic journals and online publications on cassava-based farmers in the area. Objectives were
124 analyzed using simple descriptive statistical techniques such as mean,

125 Frequency distribution, tables and percentages, Foster Greer Thorbecke (FGT) indices and
126 ordered probit model. The FGT Poverty indices are stated by (Edoumiekumo et al., 2014):

127
$$Pa = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{z-y_i}{z} \right]^\alpha \quad \text{Where,}$$

128 N = Total population (number)

129 n = Number of farmers below the poverty line (number)

130 Y_i = Per capita expenditure of those classified poor (naira)

131 α = poverty aversion parameter that takes the value 0, 1, 2 (number)

132 z = poverty line: two-third of the total expenditure (naira) and

$$z = \frac{2}{3} \left[\frac{\text{Total Expenditure}}{N} \right]$$

133 When $\alpha = 0$, the poverty incidence was calculated as follows:

134
$$P_0 = \frac{n}{N}$$

135 Poverty incidence also known as poverty head-count refers to the proportion of the total
136 population of a given group that is poor, based on a given poverty line.

137 When $\alpha = 1$, the poverty depth is stated as:

138
$$P_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{z-y_i}{z} \right)^1$$

139 The poverty depth also known as poverty gap refers to the difference between a given poverty
140 line and the mean expenditure of the poor, expressed as a ratio of the poverty line.

141 When $\alpha = 2$, the poverty severity is stated as:

142
$$P_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{z-y_i}{z} \right)^2$$

143 This is often described as a measure of the severity of poverty. While the poverty gap takes into
144 account the distance separating the poor from the poverty line, the square gap takes the square of
145 that distance into account. However, given the expenditures and poverty line generated, the
146 cassava-based farmers were further categorized into the following poverty state.

147 0 = extremely poor

148 1 = moderately poor

149 2 = slightly non poor

150 3 = Non poor

151 The ordered probit model was then used to assess the determinants of poverty status among
152 cassava-based. Whenever poverty categories have a natural order, the ordered probit is the
153 appropriate model to be employed in the estimation of relevant probabilities (Greene, 2002).

154 Ordered probit measures the probability that the dependent variable falls in one of the discrete
155 categories conditioned on levels of the independent variable. This is stated as:

$$y^* = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j X_{ji} + \mu_i$$

156 Where,

157 y^* = Unobserved variable (latent variable)

158 μ_i = error term

159 β_0, \dots, β_j = Parameters

160 X_{ji} = Independent variables of the i th farmer ($X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8$)

161 X_1 = Age (years)

162 X_2 = Education (Years)

163

164 X_3 = Farming experience (years)

165

166 X_4 = Household size (number of persons)

167 X_5 = Annual farm income (N)

168 X_6 = Farm size (hectares)

169 X_7 = Extension contact (number of visits per month)

170

171 X_8 = Membership of Cooperative (Member=1, Non-member= 0)

172 Given the various categories, the study derived the probabilities of being poor as:

$$Pr(y_i = 0) = Pr(y_i^* < \mu_1)$$

173

$$174 \quad Pr(y_i = 1) = Pr(\mu_1 \leq y_i^* < \mu_2)$$

$$Pr(y_i = 2) = Pr(\mu_2 \leq y_i^* < \mu_3)$$

$$Pr(y_i = 3) = Pr(\mu_3 \leq y_i^*)$$

175 Therefore, what was observed (y_i) is the following actual placement in the discrete category:

176 0 = extremely poor if $Y_i = 0$ if $Y_i^* < Z_1$ (extremely poor)

177

178 1 = moderately poor if $Y_i = 1$ if $Z_1 \leq Y_i^* < Z_2$ (moderately poor)

179

180 2 = slightly non poor if $Y_i = 2$ if $Z_2 \leq Y_i^* < Z_3$ (slightly non poor)

181

182 3 = Non poor if $Y_i = 3$ if $Z_3 \leq Y_i^*$ (non-poor)

183 Where

184 Y_i = Observed variable (Dependent variable)

185 Z_i = threshold parameter for the placement of y_i^* in the discrete poverty categories (constructed
186 from the poverty line).

187

188

189

190

191 Result and Discussion

192 | **Table 1: Socioeconomic characteristics of Cocoyam farmers in the study area**

193

Socio-economic variables	Mean distribution
Age	50 years
Household size	6 persons
Education	9.23 years
Years of experience	25 years
Farm size	1.03 ha

194

195

196 **Table 1:** Distribution of respondents based on their socio-economic characteristics

Gender	Frequency	% distribution
Male	20	33
Female	40	67
Marital status		
Single	7	12

Married	53	88
Level of Education		
No formal education	0	0
Primary	24	40
Secondary	28	47
Tertiary	8	13
Membership of cooperative		
Members	25	42
Non-members	35	58
No. of extension visit/month		
0	26	43
1	0	0
2	34	57
Total	60	100

197 **Source: Field Survey Data, 2019**

199 From **T**able 1, the mean age was 50 years meaning that cassava production was relatively
200 dominated by aged farmers. This could be associated with increased rural-urban migration and
201 also youth engagement in non-agricultural activities hence leaving cassava production in the
202 hands of old farmers, this could create hindrance to efficient production as Anyanwu *et.al*
203 (2012) recognized that young people are more likely to be energetic and have the capacity to
204 use innovation than aged people. The mean farm size of 1.03 ha, showed that cassava farming in
205 the study area was dominated by small farm scale farmers and this is in agreement
206 with the findings of Offor and Onyewuchi, (2013) and Anyiro *et.al* (2013) who stated that
207 most farmers have farmland of less than or equal to 1 ha. The household size of 6 persons
208 confirms an average household among cassava farmers in the area which implies that they can be
209 supportive and can serve as a cheap source of labour for farming activities thereby reducing the
210 cost of production.

Formatted: Highlight

211 This is consistent with the findings of Eze and Nwibo, (2014) in Delta State and Akpan *et al.*,
212 (2017) in Akwa Ibom State. The mean value of 25 years in cassava production shows **ed** that
213 majority of the respondents in the area have adequate experience in cassava production. Also
214 more women are involved in cassava production than men because farming is perceived as
215 female occupation (Amusa *et.al* 2011), the farmers had basic education and are literate enough
216 about the practice and can impart knowledge to others. This is in agreement with Anyanwu *et*
217 *al.* (2012), who showed that increase in the educational level of smallholder cassava farmers

Formatted: Highlight

218 will result in increase in their orientation towards cassava production for the market or
219 commercialization index.

220

221 **Estimation of Poverty Status of Cassava-Based Farmers and Determinants**

222

223 **Table 2:** Estimated Poverty Profile of Cassava-based Farmers

224

Items	Values
Poverty line (Z)	62476.67
Number below Z	15
Poverty incidence (Head count)	0.25
Poverty depth	0.0659
Poverty severity	0.0362

225 **Source: Field Survey Data, 2019**

226

227 **Table 2** showed the estimate of the poverty profile of cassava-based farmers in the study
228 area. It showed that the poverty line was ₦62476.67k. This is an indication that the
229 expenditure of a cassava-based farmer below this value was is an indication of being poor.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

230 The poverty incidence was 0.25, implying that about 25% of cassava-based farmers are
231 classified poor in the area. It also showed that the poverty depth and severity were 0.0659 and
232 0.0362 respectively. This is an indication that additional 6.59% of the total expenditure is
233 required to close the poverty gap, while at extreme cases additional 3.62% is required to
234 cross the poverty line.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

235 Using the poverty line, the farmers were further placed into four poverty categories, namely,
236 extremely poor (0), moderately poor (1), slightly non poor (2) and non-poor (3). The
237 ordered probit was then used to measure the probability that the poverty state of
238 each farmer falls in one of the category.

239

240

241 **Table 3: Estimate of Ordered Probit**

	Coefficient	Std. Error	Z	p-value
Age	0.00083926	0.00083608	-1.0038	0.31548

	6				
Education	0.110422	0.0497391	2.2200	0.02642	**
Farm experience	-0.0212265	0.0179367	-1.1834	0.23665	
Household size	-0.402818	0.102332	-3.9364	0.00008	***
Farm Income	3.38124e-05	1.43448e-05	2.3571	0.01842	**
Farm Size	0.15379	0.171299	0.8978	0.36930	
Extension contact	-0.791578	0.323866	-2.4442	0.01452	**
Membership	0.102088	0.342199	0.2983	0.76545	
Coop					
Cut1	0.214418	0.912876	0.2349	0.81430	
Cut2	1.22951	0.916981	1.3408	0.17998	
Cut3	2.09201	0.938329	2.2295	0.02578	**

242 Mean dependent var 1.440678 S.D. dependent var. 1.118361
 243 Log-likelihood -66.55774 Akaike criterion 155.1155
 244 Schwarz criterion 177.9684 Hannan-Quinn 164.0363
 245 Likelihood ratio test: Chi-square [0.0002] 29.8809

246 **Source: field survey, 2019**

247

248 The ordered probit analysis showed that education, household size, farm income and extension
 249 contact were statistically significant at 1% and 5% probability levels, respectively. However, the
 250 likelihood chi square (29.8809) was found significant at 1% probability, and as a result, the null
 251 hypothesis was rejected. Therefore the study accepted the alternative and concluded that the
 252 socioeconomic characteristics of cassava-based farmer influence poverty in the area. Given that
 253 the dependent variable of the regression, is an ordered variable, the marginal effects of the
 254 explanatory variables were computed for the four categories of poverty which, to some extent,
 255 would reflect the effect of a unit change in any explanatory variable on the probability of being
 256 extremely poor (0), moderately poor (1), slightly non poor (2), and non-poor (3).

257

258 **Table 4: Marginal Effects of Poverty Determinants**

Variables	Extremely poor (0)	Moderately poor(1)	Slightly Non Poor (2)	Non poor (3)
Age	-0.0274	-0.0272	0.0235	0.0311
Education	-0.0519	-0.0309	0.0312	0.0516
Farm Experience	-0.0166	-0.0109	0.0101	0.0174
Household size	0.0788	0.1303	-0.0125	-0.1966
Farm Income	-0.0205	-0.0182	0.0133	0.0254
Farm size	0.0107	0.0022	-0.0101	-0.0028
Extension contact	-0.0107	-0.0284	0.021	0.0181
Membership Coop	0.0059	0.0074	-0.0026	-0.0107

259 **Source: Field survey, 2019**

260 **Table 4** shows the marginal effects of poverty Determinants. Education was found positive
 261 and statistically significant at 5% probability level. Household size was found negative
 262 and statistically significant at 1% probability level. Farm income was found positive and
 263 statistically significant at 5% probability level. Extension contact was found positive and
 264 statistically significant at 5% probability level.

265 **Conclusion**

266 Cassava based farmers were mostly female. Also, from the findings, it could be concluded that
 267 the socio-economic characteristics of the cassava-based farmers significantly influence
 268 poverty status in the area and the positively significant determinants of poverty status of cassava-
 269 based farmers in the study area were level of education, household size, farm income and
 270 extension contact.

271 **Recommendation**

- 272 i. Rural people who are mostly the farm households should be encouraged to appreciate
 273 education. There is an urgent need to ensure easy access to farmers to education.
 274 Education was revealed to significantly affect the degree of poverty. When
 275 farmers are educated, they can better appreciation improved technologies and
 276 even use them appropriately thereby enhancing better resources use. It will also help
 277 the farmers understand the relevance of belonging to viable cooperative groups.

Formatted: Highlight

- 278 ii. Extension contact among cassava-based farmers in the study area should be
279 increased because it significantly affects the degree of poverty.
280 iii. Household size also significantly affects the degree of poverty this means that there is
281 need for family planning education in the rural areas of Imo State.

282

283

REFERENCES

284

285

Akpan, B.S., Jeyiol, E.N., John, D.E., Nkeme, K.K., & Okon, E.U. (2013).

286

Economic efficiency of cassava based farmers in Southern wetland region of Cross River
287 State, Nigeria: A translog model approach.

288

International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3(12), 1-7.

289

Anger, B. (2010). Poverty eradication, millennium development goals and sustainable development in
290 Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3(4), 138-142. Canada: Canadian Centre of
291 Science and Education.

292

Anyiro, C. O., Osondu, C. K., Eze, H. and Akabueze, I. C. 2013. Resource-use efficiency of rural women
293 smallholder cocoyam farmers in Onitsha Agricultural zone of Anambra, Nigeria. Research web
294 pub vol.1 (2), pp 12-17.

295

Apata, T. G., Apata, O.M., Awoniyi, S.M.O., & Igbalajobi, O.A. (2010).

296

Determinants of rural poverty in Nigeria: Evidence from smallholder farmers in South-western,
297 Nigeria. *Journal of Science and Technology Education Research*, 1(4), 85 – 91

298

Ebong, V.O., E.O. Effiong, A.J. Eshiet and H. Nuka, (2011). Resource use efficiency of landowners and
299 tenants in cassava based farms in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria: A comparative analysis. *Agric. Biol.*
300 *J. North Amer.*, 2: 1042–1047.

301

Eze, A. V., & Nwibo, S.U. (2014). Economic and technical efficiency of cassava production in

302

Ika North East Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of development and*
303 *Agricultural Economics*, 6(10), 429-436.

304

Etim, N.A., & Udoh, E.J. (2013). The determinants of rural poverty in Nigeria.

305

International Journal of Agricultural Management & Development

306

(IJAMAD). Retrieved from <http://www.ijamad.com>

307

Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nation (FAO) (2005). The definition of poverty:

308

Impacts of policies on poverty. *Conceptual and Technical Material 4(1)*. Retrieved from

309

<http://www.fao.org/tc/easypol.pdf>.

310

FAO, 2012. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012 Key messages W. and I. 2012.

311 Food and Agricultural Organization (2016). Global information and early warning system:
312 Countries requiring external assistance for food.

313 Ibekwe, U.C., Orebiyi, J.S., Henri-Ukoha, A., Okorji, E.C., Nwagbo, E.C., & Chidiebere-Mark, N.M.
314 (2012). Resource use efficiency in cassava production in South East Nigeria.
315 *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 1(1), 16-21, doi:
316 AJAEES.2012.002. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedomain.org>.

317 International Institute of Tropical Agriculture. (2015). Cassava. Oyo, Ibadan: CGIAR. Retrieved
318 from <http://www.iita.org/cassava>.

319 National Bureau of Statistics. (2014). Imo State Information. Retrieved from
320 <http://nigerianstat.gov.ng/information/details/Imo>.

321 Obasi, P. C., Henri-Ukoha, O.N., Anosike & Ibekwe, U.C. (2015). Net returns to cassava -based
322 crop mixtures in Imo state, Nigeria. *European Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Research*,
323 3(1), 15-21.

324 Oduwole, T.A. (2015). Youth Unemployment and Poverty in Nigeria. *International Journal of Sociology
325 and Anthropology Research* Vol. 1(2) pp.23-39.

326 Offor, I. R. and Onyewuchi, U. U. (2013). Assessment of the Potentials and Returns of cocoyam
327 production for food security in Okigwe local government area of Imo State, Nigeria. *Nigerian
328 Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*. 9(2):42-47

329 Olubukola O.E, Adewale I.F and Ojo S.O (2017). Empirical Analysis of Poverty Status of Small Scale
330 Cassava Processors in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Faculty of Gaziosmanpasa University*.34
331 (1), 26-32

332 Onubuogu, G.C., Esiobu, N.S., Nwosu, C.S. & Okereke, C.N. (2014). Resource use efficiency of
333 smallholder cassava farmers in Owerri Agricultural zone, Imo State, Nigeria. *Scholarly
334 Journal of Agricultural Science* Vol. 4(6), pp. 306-318.

335 Owusu V and Donkor E (2012). Adoption of improved cassava varieties in Ghana. *Agricultural Journal*,
336 Vol.7 (2): 146 – 151.
337