



AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AND FINANCIAL EMPOWERMENT OF RURAL FARMERS IN ANAMBRA STATE

Chibike Onyije Nwuba

Department of Marketing, Federal Polytechnic
Okoko
Anambra State, Nigeria

Prof. Ireneus Chukwudi Nwaizugbo

Department of Marketing, Nnamdi Azikiwe
University Awka
Anambra State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

When farmers don't properly market their produce, they will not be able to maximise their sales. This means they will never improve from their poor living conditions assuming that farming is their only activity. Small scale farmers across the world frequently consider marketing of their agricultural produce as being one of their major challenges. This research however studied the relationship between agricultural marketing and financial empowerment of rural farmers. Specifically, the study addressed the relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers, the relationship between place of production and the income of rural farmers, the relationship between price of the produce and the income of rural farmers and finally the relationship between promotion of the produce and the income of rural farmers. The study adopted a survey research design in collecting data; questionnaire and personal interviews were used in collecting primary data while documentary sources were used for secondary data. The population of the study was made up of the following of rural farmers in the twenty one (21) Local Government Areas of Anambra state. The data generated for this study were presented with frequencies and percentages, while the stated hypotheses were statistically tested with Pearson motion correlation, which was computed with the aid of the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 17. Findings from the study showed that: there is no significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers; there is a significant relationship between the place of production and the income of rural farmers; there is no significant relationship between the price of the product produced and the income of rural farmers and there is a significant relationship between the promotion products produced and the income of rural farmers.

KEYWORDS: *Agricultural Marketing, Financial Empowerment, Rural Farmers*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Agriculture provides primary means of employment for Nigeria and account for more than one third of the total gross domestic product (GDP) and labour force (Asogwa & Okwoche, 2012) and about 20% of Africa's GDP (Economic Commission for Africa, 2007). According to Nchuchuwe & Adejuwon (2012), Agriculture is the backbone of Africa's economy. Agriculture provides food security by fundamentally increasing the amount of food and also by providing the means to purchase food. Through growth in agricultural productivity and higher farm profits, the rural farmers can be financially empowered. Marketing of these agricultural produce plays an important role in attaining the overall goal of food security, farmers' financial empowerment by way of poverty reduction

and sustainable agriculture, mostly among smallholder farmers in developing countries (Altshul, 1998).

Karani & Wanjohi (2017) posited that without good marketing the farmers will not be able to sell or trade hence they will not reap maximum returns from their produce. This means they will never improve from their poor living conditions assuming that farming is their only activity. Small scale farmers across the world frequently consider marketing of their agricultural produce as being one of their major challenges. According to Badar (2011), the field of marketing has assumed pivotal importance in modern day business world and is considered a key for the success of any business. It facilitates the producers in supplying goods and services that satisfy wants of the consumers at profit. The knowledge of marketing guides the producers about what and how much to



produce, how to produce, when, and where to deliver their goods and services. The producers driven by market knowledge are able to formulate superior and innovative strategies to serve the consumers with products and services in the most desirable and efficient way.

However, agricultural products differ from other industrial products due to their perishable nature and special requirements during various farm and marketing operations. But, this does not infer that the field of agricultural marketing is completely diverse from marketing of industrial and other products. It is basically the application of marketing principles in agriculture sector. Acharya & Agarwal (2010) defined agricultural marketing as comprising of all activities involved in supply of farm inputs to the farmers and movements of agricultural products from the farms to the consumers. According to Asogwa & Okwoche (2012), marketing of agricultural products begins at the farm when the farmer harvests his products and when they are harvested, those products cannot usually go directly to the consumers. Firstly, it is likely to be located in some area far from the place of consumption in regular and continuous manner throughout the year. Secondly, storage is required to adjust supply to meet demand. Thirdly, a product when it has been harvested is rarely in a form acceptable to consumers. Therefore, it must be sorted, cleared and processed in various ways and must be presented to the consumer in convenient quality and quantities for sale. Finally the farmer expects payment when his produce are sold, and therefore some financial arrangements must be prepared to insure all the various stages until the retailer sells the products to the final consumer.

Agricultural marketing plays a major role in the economic development of a country not only in less developed countries but in developed countries as well. In case of less developed countries, the development of agricultural marketing system assumes more importance as their economies largely rely on agricultural sector and almost half of the labour force is usually employed in agricultural sector. Rural poverty is a well-known phenomenon and consumer spending on food stuff constitutes major share of their income. Therefore, it is argued in the literature that development of agricultural marketing system is at the heart of economic development (Badar, 2011), and by extension, the farmers are financially empowered.

Anambra State is in no doubt blessed with enterprising farmers, who are engaged in production of various crops and animal farming. Notwithstanding the fact that over the years, they have made remarkable efforts in lifting their productive capacities to a greater height, by using local and low yielding varieties, they still face many constraints, such as poor infrastructures,

inappropriate technology, inability of farmers to generate sufficient income to finance their investment, but the most critical of these is poor marketing system. Marketing the farmers' produce is usually right there at the farm gate or/and in the village market instead of moving them to distant markets where better prices are assured. A close gaze at these situations discloses that most farmers are still small-scale farmers with petite or no funds to grow their farm enterprise beyond subsistence level. The only ways open to a rural farmer to derive some reasonable income from his farm produce is through efficient agricultural marketing.

An effectual marketing system guarantees higher levels of income for the farmers by decreasing the number of middlemen or by limiting the cost of marketing services and the malpractices. These assures the farmers better prices for their farm products and persuades them to devote their surpluses in purchasing of modern inputs to boost productivity and production which ultimately results in an upsurge in the surplus to be marketed and income of the farmers. If the producer does not have an easily accessible market-output where he can sell his surplus produce, he has little incentive to produce more. The need for providing adequate incentives for increased production is, therefore, very important, and this can be made possible only by streamlining the marketing system (Acharaya & Agarwal, 2010).

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

Improvements in Nigerian Agricultural sector performance is possible if the right marketing strategies can be identified and adopted. Studies pointing marketing as a potent tool for organizational performance are tremendous, yet knowledge of how it can be used to improve agricultural sector and empower farmers in rural areas of Nigeria appear shallow. Nebo & Ejionueme (2017) asserted that studies have identified marketing variables that can improve organizational performance, yet very few of these studies were undertaken to specifically apply to Nigeria's agricultural sector and that even among studies that try to identify marketing variables that influence organizational performance, reports of inconsistencies is wide. For example, McDaniel & Hise (1984) found that chief executives officers judge two of the 4Ps, price and products to be somewhat more important than the other two, place and promotion while LaLonde (1977) found product related criteria to be more important followed by distribution, price and promotion. Similarly some scholars argue that agricultural sector performance can be improved if problems of marketing agricultural products can be identified and solved. A number of factors have been identified in previous studies as problems of marketing agricultural products, however, the context within which these



studies are carried out are known to influence the significance of these problems in specific situations. Agricultural marketing problems identified by past studies in other countries or regions may not be exactly the same with that of Nigeria. Therefore it is important to identify these agricultural marketing problems in the Nigerian context and categorize them according to their level of significance. In addition, the quantum of past research studies seem to focus more attention on agricultural production inputs as a way of improving agricultural sector performance in Nigeria relative to agricultural marketing. There seems to be a conspicuous lack of knowledge of marketing approach to promoting agricultural sector performance in Nigeria. From previous studies, it appears that there is no robust agricultural marketing policy in Nigeria. Hence there is the need to direct government in crafting policies that are likely to improve agricultural sector performance in Nigeria from agricultural marketing perspective. These apparent paucities and knowledge gaps in the literature are the problems necessitating this study.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The objective of the study is to analyse the relationship between agricultural marketing and financial empowerment of rural farmers in Anambra State. In specific sense, the study seeks to ascertain:

- If there is a significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State;
- If there is a significant relationship between distribution of the farm produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State;
- If there is a significant relationship between price of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State;
- If there is a significant relationship between promotion of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are relevant to the stated objective above and shall be tested in this study:

1. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.
2. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between distribution of the farm produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.
3. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between price of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.
4. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between promotion of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1 Agricultural Marketing

There are numerous definitions for the term agricultural marketing, one of which is the definition given by the National Commission on Agriculture in India which asserts that agricultural marketing is a process that begins with the choice to produce a saleable farm commodity which comprises all aspects of the market structure, both functional and institutional, based on technical and economic considerations and which also includes pre and post-harvest operations, assembling, grading, storage, transportation and distribution. On the other hand, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research defines agricultural marketing as involving three most important functions namely: assembling; processing; and lastly distribution. The term agricultural marketing can simply mean the use of marketing concept in dealing with agricultural products. Agricultural marketing is the anticipation, identification and satisfaction of the needs of consumers in agricultural markets. It begins before production by determining what products consumers would need and continues after production by ensuring that what is produced are packaged, processed, stored, transported, standardized, graded, priced, promoted and made available to the consumers through various marketing channel members such as farmers, agents, wholesalers and retailers (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014). It encompasses agricultural pre-production, production and post-production activities targeted at satisfying human needs. Agricultural marketing brings producer and consumers together for the exchange of agricultural products for money or some other valuables. Specifically, agricultural marketing helps to determine what agricultural products to produce, how to produce it and for whom to produce it and how to transfer what has been produced to the final consumers (Nebo & Ejionueme, 2017).

Badar (2011) stated that agricultural marketing system generally comprises of five main stakeholders or market actors i.e. “producers, traders, trade supporters, trade planners/decision makers and consumers”. Each of these stakeholders has its own specific marketing goals as described below. The producers or farmers are main stakeholders in an agricultural marketing system, they produce a wide range of food items for self-consumption as well as for supply to the market. Agricultural producers are interested in maximisation of their net farm income and aversion of risks involved in production and marketing of their produce. Moreover, they want developed and guaranteed markets, improved market position, increased and stabilised prices for outputs besides stable supply and prices of inputs. Traders are the people who mostly operate in the markets and relate producers with consumers. Commission men,



brokers, wholesalers and retailers all belong to this group. Traders wish to have high volume of produce and profit, time and cost efficient purchasing, no trade restrictions and minimum market risk. Trade supporters do not directly partake in the trading activities of the market. They support and facilitate performance of trading activities and are interested in enhancing efficiency in exchange of goods. Smooth functioning of market systems and general support to market exchange function such as infrastructure and communication are the main goals of trade supporter. Trade planners and decision makers are responsible for making decisions relating to agricultural marketing. Planners and decision makers have social and political goals largely connected to securing sufficient food supplies and growing domestic agriculture markets. Other major objectives of this group include price stabilisation and promotion of export sector. The last group in the marketing chain comprises of consumers but their influence is considered a derived function which is executed through traders and trade institutions. Major objectives of consumers include acquisitions of good quality products, low prices of products and better services.

Nebo & Ejionueme (2017) examined certain marketing factors that have been empirically identified to influence performance of agricultural sector. They include:

1. Problems that constrain agricultural marketing
2. Product
3. Price
4. Distribution
5. Marketing Promotion

Problems that constrain agricultural marketing: Various studies, both in developed and developing nations have shown that problems of agricultural marketing can have significant influence on the performance of agricultural sector. The factors that are consistently mentioned in the literature as problems of marketing agricultural product can conveniently be grouped into three. These are: production, distribution and pricing related problems (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014, Uturu, 2002; Ugwuanyi & Ugwuanyi, 1999; Okuneye, 2012; Kohl & Uhl, 2002). Production related problems refers to the problems related to the production of agricultural products. These are Land tenure system, soil fertility, flood, fire, irrigation, poor weather, pests and rodents attacks and lack of agricultural inputs such as capital, fertilizer, improved seedlings and modern farm technology. Distribution-related problems are constraints related to transfer of products' titles amongst channel members or marketing logistics such as transportation, storage and market stall facilities that aid the movement of agricultural products from farm or ranches to market. Price-

related problems are problems related to pricing of agricultural produce such as high cost of production and distribution and farmers' inability to control prices due to perishable, homogeneous and seasonal nature of agricultural products.

Agricultural Products: A product is anything that the buyer acquires or purchases to satisfy a need or want. It is regarded as anything that can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition, use or consumption to satisfy a need or want (Armstrong & Kotler, 2005). It includes physical goods, services, ideas, places, persons and organizations. Consumers buy products in order to provide solutions to their problems or needs. Agricultural products are industrial and household natural products which originate from farms, ranches, orchards, fields, vineyards and in the waters of oceans, lakes and rivers which have not undergone any serious manufacturing and processing (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014). They can be described as goods in or near to their first stage of transformation (Gordon-Ashworth, 1984). It is a good or service for which the core benefits is largely undifferentiated. According to Brown (2005), agricultural products are those grown or raised from land while they remain in an unprocessed or partially processed state. Products that are harvested or fished from bodies of water are also agricultural products until they have undergone substantial transformation. Agricultural products are parts of primary commodities. One criterion of a primary commodity is the relative lack of differentiation among producers. Many scholars agree that modern marketing activities begin before production (Onyeke & Nebo, 2012; Armstrong & Kotler, 2005). This means that marketer's first task is to engage in research to identify the products that will meet the buyers' needs. Based on these, agricultural produce can be classified into six which are: foods, fibres, fuels, raw materials, pharmaceutical drugs/stimulants and ornamental or exotic products (Nebo & Ejionueme, 2017). By industrial standards they can be classified into subsectors as: livestock and meat, poultry, aquatic, fruits and vegetables, milk and dairy, grain, cotton and textile as well as tobacco subsectors (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014).

Agricultural Prices: This is the value of a commodity or service expressed in monetary terms (Pride & Ferrel, 1995). It is the money paid or agreed in exchange for a product. Price and pricing decisions are variables in agricultural marketing. Even if all other aspect of agricultural marketing elements is right, with the wrong price neither the buyer nor the producer will be willing to engage in exchange transaction. Price determines demand and supply. Owing to the homogeneity of agricultural products,



prices are often determined by forces of supply and demand. Farmers take prices rather than fix prices. Similarly, prices fluctuate often due to seasonality of some agricultural products resulting in low prices during on-seasons and high prices during off-seasons. Storage, transportation, off-season planting, exporting, improved seedlings, processing and guaranteed minimum price are all effective strategies farmers can adopt to get better prices at harvest seasons (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014). Production and distribution costs, mark-ups, discounts and competition are price variables investigated in this study.

Distribution of Agricultural Products:

Distribution is the courses taken in the transfer of title of a product from the first owner in this case the farmer to the last owner which is the consumer (Ejionueme & Nebo, 2014). All agricultural marketing efforts come to nothing unless products from the farmers' orchards, ranches or farms get to the consumers who need them. In performing the delivery functions, products and their titles pass through certain paths or routes from the producers to the consumers. These routes are called distribution or trade channels. Distribution function creates form, time, place and possession utilities to products. Geographical specializations are common in agricultural productions; therefore produce must be moved from the areas of surplus to areas of shortage using channel members and key logistics such as transportation, packaging and storage facilities. Storage is a marketing function which entails the accumulation of agricultural produce from time to time in a storage house until they are needed by consumers. It helps agricultural marketers to hold excess produce during the harvesting seasons and protects the produce against adverse weather conditions. Transportation is the movements of produce from where they are produced to where they are needed through various transportation modes such as trains, pipeline, trucks, air craft, vessels and ocean liners.

Marketing communications or

promotion: These are often not used by individual farmer to influence demand for agricultural produce because of their undifferentiated or homogeneous nature. Any promotional expenditure by one producer of a particular commodity will benefit another producer of the same commodity without paying a dime.

Badar (2011) identified the roles and benefits of agricultural marketing to farmers and in economic development. This includes:

1. An effective agricultural marketing system has a palpable impact on marketable and

marketed output of the farmers and thus adds to overall national income of a country.

2. The marketing sector assists in providing capital and necessary business skills for trading to the budding entrepreneurs and traders which are prerequisites for economic development.
3. It updates farm production structure via development of a commercialised form of production and improved specialisation.
4. It improves the efficiency of resource allocation and expands the size of the market.
5. Marketing improvements grows the market orientation of the farmers by making them more receptive to market indications and thereby guide them in better production planning.
6. It provides an effective link between rural and urban areas by facilitating the movement of factors of production, goods and services.
7. The consumer is not disillusioned by multiple grades, multiple prices, misleading labels, adulteration and the inadequacy of market service, which leads to the maximisation of aggregate social welfare in the context of an improved marketing system.
8. Improved market structure reduces the chances of the occurrence of produce losses, rises incentives for production and guarantees favourable prices to the producers via reduced marketing margins.
9. It accelerates the pace of capital formation through a reliable marketing system which ensures a stable and favourable cost-return relationship for the producers and easier as well as quicker availability of a technology package.
10. The formation and development of marketing infrastructural facilities increases farmers' access to markets, improve efficiency of commodity movements and encourages market integration.
11. The improved market organisation transmits correct market responses and minimises the scope of distorted market signals.
12. A marketing system that promptly respond to changing conditions in world market improves the competitiveness of exports and contributes to foreign exchange earning of the country.

2.1.2 Financial Empowerment

Empowerment is a process and a goal. As the process, empowerment is a series of activities to strengthen a power or the existence of a weak group



in society. As the goal, empowerment refers to condition or outcomes to be achieved by a social change, i.e. making a person or a community to become strong enough to participate in a variety of control, having knowledge and the ability to meet the needs of their life physically, economically and socially. The definition of empowerment as a goal often becomes an indicator of the success of empowerment as a process. Elements of the force to be owned by the community to be empowered include: communication access, confidence, leadership, institutional & organizational abilities, networking, skills, and reliable. The success of community empowerment can be seen from their ability against economic access, prosperity access, and cultural as well as political ability. Empowerment not only includes the strengthening of individual community members, but also the institutions. Instilling the values of modern culture, such as hard work, thrift, openness, and responsibility are main part of empowerment effort and similarly, the renewal of the social institutions and its integration into development activities and the role of the public in them. Empowerment is a process by which those excluded are able to partake more fully in decisions makings, strategies of development, and distribution of their product. Community empowerment is an attempt to enhance the dignity of people in the present conditions which are unable to escape from the trap of poverty and underdevelopment, in other word; empowerment is enabling and creating self-reliance society.

Empowerment being defined as the process of growing the capability of individuals or groups to make choices and to convert those choices into desired actions, financial empowerment therefore is the transmission of personal money power (financial independence) to an individual. It is the process of moving from financial unsteadiness to a position of financial stability through investment. According to Wikipedia (2018), financial independence is a state in which an individual or household has sufficient wealth to live on without having to depend on income from some form of employment. Financially independent individuals have assets that generates income (cash flow) that is at least equal to their expenses. Canada (n.d) stated that financial empowerment is a new approach to poverty reduction that focuses on improving the financial security of low-income people. It is an evidence-driven set of interventions that have proven successful at both eliminating systemic barriers to the full financial inclusion of low-income people and providing enabling supports that aid them obtain and practice the financial skills and behaviours that palpably improve their financial outcomes and shape their financial security. The financial empowerment tactic focuses on community level approaches that

encompass five main types of interventions that have been recognised as both essential for low-income households to improve their financial outcomes, and effective at helping them do so. Financial Empowerment can mean different strategies for everyone. However, everyone can agree that to be financially empowered is to have adequate finances, to meet your financial obligations, as well as acquire financial wealth to take care of future and unexpected expenses

2.1.3 Empowering rural farmers through Agricultural Marketing

Chokera, Ngwenya & Njovo (2014) noted that in the past research and agricultural development organisations and agencies were preoccupied with developing strategies of increasing food productivity by small holder farmers, however, today there seems to be a shift of focus in which researchers and agencies seek to understand ways and means of improving the livelihoods of farmers especially those in rural communities through identifying profitable markets for their produce. Smith (2001) identified rural development as a complicated process involving a network of actors and stakeholders who pool resources together in achieving set objectives. In other words Smith viewed rural development as a product of stakeholder co-operation in which different parties come together to bring about rural development. In Nigeria stakeholders who can participate in developing rural areas include the government, rural farmers, transport agencies, development agencies, buyers of agricultural produce which can be the local supermarkets, wholesalers and national buyers. While it is the primary duty of the government to develop rural areas, the prevailing political and economic situation has crippled the government's capacity to improve infrastructure in the rural communities. On the other hand the private sector is unable to assist government through corporate social responsibility programs as most companies across industries are facing run away from siting their companies in the rural areas because of the lack of basic amenities such as power supply and good road networks. Also the works of Smith (2001) called for stakeholder co-operation in order to achieve development in rural communities; the challenge of capacity has hampered this since the above actors are suffering from resource constraints, noting also that infrastructural development is not only a problem in the rural areas but even in the major towns and cities, where roads are in a state of disrepair with numerous pot holes and driving in these roads have become a nightmare for motorists. Chokera, Ngwenya & Njovo (2014) called on rural farmers themselves to form partnerships and start to identify the critical resources that they need to develop infrastructure in their communities.



Furthermore, they also argued that rural farmers can take advantage of the presence of many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) operating in their communities and seek assistance in terms of improving the state of roads and bridges so that access to market centres can be improved.

2.1.4 Relationship between Marketing and Agricultural Sector Performance in Nigeria

Nebo & Ejionueme (2017) noted that there is a high level of linkage, interconnection and interrelationships between agriculture and marketing. Agricultural marketing complements agricultural production. Every agricultural produce needs to be sold immediately or presented for future sales or used after harvest. Agriculture cannot be thorough without effectively marketing its produce. Marketing moves agricultural produce from places of surplus to areas of deficit. Marketing makes it possible for some seasonal agricultural products to be consumed throughout the year by storage functions. Marketing transfers ownership of agricultural produce from the farmer to the consumers. It also changes agricultural products in ways desired by consumers by sorting, grading standardizations, packaging, processing and preservation functions. Agricultural marketing tells the users and buyers where and when to find the products and at what prices they are sold. Pricing which is considered as a marketing function, guide and regulates production choices of farmers. For example, farmers can switch from corn production to soybeans when the price ratio favours soybeans and vice versa. Ideally market conditions dictate farmers' operational plans in terms of what quantity to produce. Minten (1999) in his study discovered that agricultural producer prices decrease significantly as the distance to main roads increases and the quality of infrastructure (market access) decreases. Similarly Kamara (2004), studied the Impact of Market Access on Agricultural Input Use and Productivity in Machakos District, Kenya and found that all inputs and agricultural productivity increased with improvement in the access of farmers to output markets. He concluded that prioritizing the improvement of market access is an important approach to rural development as it gives farmers the opportunity to engage in more meaningful agricultural productivity. This means that marketing aids agricultural development.

2.2 Theoretical Concept

The study was anchored on the theory of Agricultural Location Johann Heinrich von Thünen, a Prussian landowner, introduced an early theory of agricultural location in *Der isolierte Staat* (1826) (*The Isolated State*). The Thünen model suggested that accessibility to the market can create a complete system of agricultural land use. His

model predicted a single market surrounded by farmland, both situated on a plain of complete physical homogeneousness. Transportation costs over the plain were related only to the distance travelled and the volume shipped. The model presumed that farmers surrounding the market will produce crops which will have the highest market value and that will give them the maximum net profit (the location, or land, rent). The defining factor in the location rent is the transportation costs, and when the transportation costs are low, the location rent will be high and vice versa. This situation will produce a rent gradient along which the location rent decreases as the distance from the market increases and eventually reaching zero. The Thünen model also addressed the location of intensive versus extensive agriculture in relation to the same market. Intensive agriculture will possess a steep gradient and will locate closer to the market than extensive agriculture. Different crops will possess different rent gradients. Perishable crops (vegetables and dairy products) will possess steep gradients while less perishable crops (grains) will possess less steep gradients.

2.3 Empirical Review

Chokera, Ngwenya & Njovo (2014) qualitatively studied on the role of agricultural marketing on improving the livelihoods of rural farmers in Masvingo province. The study focuses on four issues (1) major crops grown (2) current markets for produce (3) institutions that support farmers (4) challenges faced by farmers in production, pricing, promotion and transporting produce to profitable markets. Data was gathered from 361 respondents being farmers specialising in the production of maize, groundnuts, small grain crops and vegetables, extension officers, bursars of boarding schools, churches and hospitals as well as supermarkets owners using in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. The findings indicated that maize, rapoko, millet, groundnuts and vegetables are widely grown; Urban dealers, boarding schools, hospitals, churches and Supermarkets are the foremost markets currently absorbing produce; inputs supply, transport, Lack of market information affect farmers in pricing agricultural produce. The paper concluded that rural farmers lack market information as they still rely on the traditional selling approach. The paper thus recommended that government should improve the state of the roads; establish training centers to equip farmers with marketing skills, and the need for the rural farmers to establish their own marketing board which will be responsible for identifying markets and delivery of produce direct to the target markets.

Asogwa & Okwoche (2012) examined the marketing of agricultural produce among rural farm households in Nigeria using sorghum marketing in Benue State as a case study. Data were collected



from randomly sampled 100 sorghum marketers in Benue State using a structured questionnaire. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution and percentages as well as marketing margin analysis and t-test statistic. The marketing margin of an average sorghum marketer in the study area was 34.43% which implied that 100% retail price paid by the final consumer resulted in farm-to-retail price spread (marketing margin) of 34%. The study revealed that: an average sorghum marketer in the study area earns a farm-to-retail price spread of 0.34 Naira for every 1 Naira retail price paid by the final consumer in the marketing process; the marketers in the study area had significant marketing margin during their marketing transaction and that the welfare of sorghum marketers was fully derived from the business which they transact, suggesting that sorghum marketing serves as a source of livelihood for the respondents.

Karani & Wanjohi (2017) studied the factors influencing marketing of agricultural produce among small-scale farmers using sorghum in giaki location, meru county Kenya as case study. The study embarked on the influence of middlemen in the market, road infrastructure, and access to marketing information, on marketing of agricultural produce among small scale farmers. The research was conducted using descriptive research design and the data was collected using questionnaires. The target population consisted of all the 212 households which were involved in sorghum produce in Giaki location. The sample size was 138 sorghum farmers. The variables were correlated using statistical methods through SPSS. The study found that Majority of smallholder farmers (89.5%) use middlemen as market link while marketing their sorghum produce. 96.2 % of the respondents felt that middlemen are exploitive to small scale sorghum farmers. Majority of the respondents (69.1%) felt that middlemen in the market are important. The study also found out that most of the respondents (52.6 %) use dusty roads when marketing their sorghum produce. The study also revealed that 72.2 % use mobile phones as mode of accessing marketing information since it's convenience to everyone. 69.9% of the respondents get the information from the middlemen as their source. It was established that there was a strong positive correlation between Access to information and sorghum marketing a figure of 0.679, followed by middlemen in market a figure of 0.510 while road infrastructure had the weakest positive correlation of 0.390 with sorghum marketing. Moreover all the variables were significant at 95% confidence level with sorghum marketing.

Nebo & Ejionueme (2017) investigated the role of adopting agricultural marketing approach for improving agricultural sector performance in Nigeria. The objectives of the study included; to determine the

significant problems of marketing agricultural products in Nigeria, to ascertain the influence of products on agricultural sector performance in Nigeria, to assess the influence of distribution on agricultural sector performance in Nigeria and to determine the influence of price on agricultural sector performance in Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for this study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 250 agricultural marketers comprising of farmers and farm products' distributors in South-eastern Nigeria. The reliability of the research instrument was ascertained using Cronbach Alpha test which yielded 0.81 coefficient. Hypotheses were tested using Principal Component and Regression Analysis. Findings show that production, distribution and pricing-related factors were the most significant problems of agricultural marketing; and that products, distribution and price were marketing variables likely to significantly improve agricultural sector performance in Nigeria. It was recommended that government; entrepreneurs who are non-governmental organizations and large scale farmers should provide effective solutions to those major variables identified in this study as hindrance to agricultural marketing and also capitalize on those marketing variables that have significant influence on agricultural performance in Nigeria to improve the sector.

Barnabas (2017) examined the effect of transportation in the marketing of agricultural products in selected markets in Jos North LGA of Plateau State. The main objectives of the study were to ascertain the relationship between efficient transportation system and the cost of agricultural products and to determine the impact of transportation on the availability of agricultural products in Jos North LGA. Survey research method was employed. Respondents were drawn from GadaBiu, FarinGada, and Statellite Markets. Tables and percentages were used for data presentation. Findings showed that transportation plays an important role in the distribution of agricultural products, helps in creating market for agricultural product and reduces spoilage and wastage of farm products. It also showed that improvement in transportation can encourage farmers to work hard in increasing production. The study recommended that Federal, State and Local Governments should provide adequate transportation system which will help in conveying the farm products from their places of production to places of consumption and that all transportation facilities in the country should be upgraded by Federal Government and there should be general improvement in the transportation system which will encourage farmers to work harder.

Prusty, Biswal & Hathy (2013) did an empirical analysis on regulated agricultural



marketing system for economic development of Jajpur district in Orissa (India). The objectives of the study were: to evaluate the role of agricultural marketing for the development of rural economy of the district and the steps taken by state government in agricultural marketing; to assess the regulated agricultural knowledge based marketing system and to give some suggestions for the improvement of efficiency and transparency in the marketing of agricultural produce. The study was based on the data collected from various primary and secondary sources. The primary data are collected through two sets of questionnaires and one set of interview schedule were developed to obtain data from the producer farmers, consumers and officials associated with the agricultural marketing activities. Potential surveys and techno-economic survey were also consulted. The secondary data was gotten from the published magazines like District statistical Abstract (A Govt. of Odisha Publication) and Economic Review. Data were tested and analysed through the computer based statistical techniques like correlations and multiple regression. Statistical tools like average, co-efficient of variation, multiple regressions, analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were applied to examine the result. Findings from the study showed that majority of farmers depend on their peers for access of information related to marketing of produce, many of the regulated wholesale markets have a principal market with large area and relatively better infrastructure and number of sub-yards attached to the principal market and that the establishment of regulated markets has helped in creating orderly and transparent marketing conditions in primary assembling markets.

Bajrang (2017) descriptively studied agricultural marketing as a catalyst for rural marketing in India. The purpose of the paper was to highlight the importance of agricultural marketing for the development of the rural India, to investigate the problems of agricultural marketing, and to show up the opportunities of rural and agricultural marketing in India. Descriptive research design was adopted and data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Finding from the study show that economic development of the country depends on the development of its rural people and that depends on development of agricultural produce and productivity. The study called on Manufacturers and marketers should strive to reduce the production cost and to minimize distribution costs. Simultaneously, product price and durability should be given priority while entering in rural market and that marketers should invest in infrastructure and communication facilities.

Maponya et al (2015) highlighted the determinants of agricultural market participation and the promotion of the establishment of vegetable

markets, fruit markets and nurseries in the Sarah Baartman district, Eastern Cape, South Africa. The research was conducted by taking a representative sample consisting of 49 agricultural projects, with 664 beneficiaries participating in this project. Nine (9) local municipalities were visited: Ndlambe, Makana, Blue Crane, Camdeboo, Ikwezi, Sundays River, Kouga, Kaukama and Baviaans. Quantitative and qualitative design was used as a detailed questionnaire written in English, with a focus group discussion, a stakeholder's discussion, and field observations as part of the data collection. A purposive sampling technique was used to select forty-nine (49) projects, in order to cover uniformity and homogenous characteristics such as infrastructure requirements, skills availability, production challenges, agricultural training needs, water source needs, educational level and others. Data was coded, captured and analysed with a software package for social sciences (SPSS version 20) using Descriptive Analysis and Univariate Regression Analysis. The results showed a significant association among the following variables: age, educational level, farming experience, land, land acquisition, crop planted, water source, water rights, agricultural training and market participation. Based on the results, it is recommended that fruit and vegetable markets be established, as well as the creation of a complete, viable agro value chain that will expand community driven agricultural production and processing.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher adopted a survey research design in collecting the data. This helped the researcher in answering research questions and the testing the hypotheses. The population of the study was made up of the rural farmers in the twenty one (21) Local Government Areas of Anambra state. Since the researcher could not study the entire population because it is an infinite population, the Cochran general accepted formula for determining sample size for an infinite population was used to determine the sample size for this study as follows:

$$Ss = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{C^2}$$

Z = Confidence Interval = 95% = 1.96
 P = Percentage of Population = 50 = 0.5
 C = Confidence Level = 0.04 = 0.08
 Substituting the figures in the formular

$$Ss = \frac{1.96 \times 0.5(1-0.5)}{0.08}$$

$$Ss = 6.125 \times 100 = 612$$



The data generated for the study were presented with frequencies and percentages, while the stated hypotheses were statistically tested with Pearson motion correlation, which was computed

with the aid of the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 17.

4.1 DATA PRESENTATION

4.1.1 Presentation of Question Data (Section A)

Figure 4.1 Total Number of Questionnaires Administered

Options	Frequency	Percentage %
Number of questionnaires administered	612	100%
Total number of questionnaires duly filled, returned and valid for analysis	542	88.6%
Number of questionnaire not returned	70	11.4%

Source: Researchers' Field Work 2019

Figure 4.2 Responses on Gender

Options	Frequency	Percentage %
Male	226	41.7%
Female	316	58.3%
Total	542	100%

Source: Researchers' Field Work 2019

Figure 4.3 Responses on Educational Qualification

Options	Frequency	Percentage %
No formal educational qualification	101	18.6%
First School Leaving Certificate	113	20.8%
Secondary School Certificate Examination	192	35.4%
Bachelors' Degree (University Degree)	108	19.9%
Postgraduate Degree	28	5.2%
Total	542	100%

Source: Researchers' Field Work 2019

Figure 4.4: Responses on Marital Status

Options	Frequency	Percentage %
Single	23	4.2%
Married	316	58.3%
Divorced	0	0
Widowed	203	37.5%
Total	542	100%

Source: Researchers' Field Work 2019

Figure 4.5: Responses on Age

Options	Frequency	Percentage %
15 - 30 years	78	14.4%
31 - 45 years	91	16.8%
46 - 60 years	195	36%
61 years and above	178	32.%
Total	542	100%

Source: Researchers' Field Work 2019



Figure 4.6: Tabular presentation of questionnaire data

S/N	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
PRODUCT						
1	Do you agree that products that satisfy the buyers need is what the rural farmer needs to be able make profitable sales?	500	30	12	0	0
2	Do you agree that farm products are necessitates in every household and as such are always purchased when available?	256	57	102	97	30
3	Do you agree that farm products that are seasonal do not have a relationship with the farmers' income?	90	67	217	118	50
4	Do you agree that farm products that are perishable do not have a relationship with the farmers' income?	189	90	76	100	87
	Mean	258.75	61	101.75	78.75	41.75
PRICE						
1	Do you agree that farm products are mostly sold at a give-away price?	187	75	98	119	63
2	Do you agree that demand and supply of farm products also affect their prices?	219	102	53	121	47
3	Do you agree that lack of storage facilities affects the prices at which farm products are being sold?	311	109	51	44	27
4	Farm products are sold at a better price in the cities than in the rural areas where they are harvested?	402	54	12	31	43
	Mean	279.75	85	53.5	78.75	45
PLACE						
1	Do you agree that most farm products are sold on the spot of harvest?	116	119	59	111	137
2	Farm products are mostly taken to the village market before they could be sold?	101	115	119	131	76
3	Farm products are mostly sold in the cities than in the villages?	99	112	71	161	99
4	Rural farmers also sell their products online?	119	121	93	101	108
	Mean	108.75	116.75	85.5	126	105
PROMOTION						
1	Rural farmers go from house to house informing people about their farmer products?	98	99	65	199	81
2.	Rural farmers make use of the village town-carrier to inform the public about their products?	77	54	88	281	42
3.	Rural farmers make use of the social media in promoting their products?	12	55	78	311	98
4.	Rural farmers make use of paid agents to advertise their products?	154	121	66	101	100
	Mean	82.25	82.25	74.25	223	80.25
FARMERS INCOME						
1.	Money realized from the sale of farm products can be used to provide basic needs for a family of six?	10	23	11	289	209
2.	Rural farmers still have saving after providing for the basic needs of their	4	13	21	333	171



	families?					
3.	Rural farming can serve as a source of livelihood to its dwellers?	190	311	16	7	18
4.	Government assistance by way of providing mechanised farming can improve the income of rural farming?	119	213	67	98	45
	Mean	80.75	140	28.75	181.75	110.75

4.2 Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H_0 : There is no significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Correlations

		PRODUCT	INCOME
PRODUCT	Pearson Correlation	1	-.369
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.541
	N	5	5
INCOME	Pearson Correlation	-.369	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.541	
	N	5	5

From the correlation result, the product produced has a weak negative correlation of $-.369$ with income of rural farmers in Anambra State. This implies that the quantity, nature, kind or quality of product produced only has a weak negative relationship with financial empowerment of rural farmers in Anambra State. This also implies that an increase in the product produced will lead to only a less than proportionate decrease on farmers' income.

DECISION: Since the computed correlation coefficient r $-.369$ is less than the critical r value $.666$

for two-tailed test at 0.05 level of significance, we therefore accept the null hypothesis, meaning that, there is no significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Hypothesis Two

H_0 : There is no significant relationship between distribution of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Correlations

		PLACE	INCOME
PLACE	Pearson Correlation	1	.956*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.011
	N	5	5
INCOME	Pearson Correlation	.956*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	
	N	5	5

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From the correlation result, the distribution of the produce has a high positive correlation of $.956$ with income of rural farmers in Anambra State. This implies that the location, distance, accessibility and other factors that have to do with the distribution strategies adopted by the farmers have a very high

positive relationship with financial empowerment of rural farmers in Anambra State and will also lead to a more than proportionate increase in their income.

DECISION: Since the computed correlation coefficient r $.956$ is more than the critical r value $.666$ for two-tailed test at 0.05 level of significance, we



therefore reject the null hypothesis, meaning that, there is a significant relationship between the distribution of the produce and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Hypothesis Three

H₀: There is no significant relationship between price of the product and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Correlations

		PRICE	INCOME
PRICE	Pearson Correlation	1	-.152
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.808
	N	5	5
INCOME	Pearson Correlation	-.152	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.808	
	N	5	5

From the correlation result, the price of the product has a weak negative correlation of -.152 with income of rural farmers in Anambra State. This implies that an increase in the price of the product produced will lead to only a less than proportionate decrease on farmers' income.

there is no significant relationship between the price of the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

DECISION: Since the computed correlation coefficient r -.152 is less than the critical r value .666 for two-tailed test at 0.05 level of significance, we therefore accept the null hypothesis, meaning that,

Hypothesis Four

H₀: There is no significant relationship between promotion of products produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

Correlations

		PROMOTION	INCOME
PROMOTION	Pearson Correlation	1	.735
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.157
	N	5	5
INCOME	Pearson Correlation	.735	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.157	
	N	5	5

From the correlation result, promotion of products produced has a high positive correlation of .735 with income of rural farmers in Anambra State. This implies that the method of promotion used by rural farmers will have a very high positive relationship with their financial empowerment and will also lead to a more than proportionate increase in their income.

5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

From the results of the correlation coefficient of the different hypotheses, the study found the following:

- There is no significant relationship between the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.
- There is a significant relationship between the distribution strategies adopted by rural farmers and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.
- There is no significant relationship between the price of the product produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

DECISION: Since the computed correlation coefficient r .735 is more than the critical r value .666 for two-tailed test at 0.05 level of significance, we therefore reject the null hypothesis, meaning that, there is a significant relationship between the promotion products produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.



- There is a significant relationship between the promotion of products produced and the income of rural farmers in Anambra State.

5.2 CONCLUSION

The marketing of agricultural crops play an important role not only in stimulating production and consumption but also in accelerating the pace of economic development. It is not only an economic link between the producers and consumers but also maintains balance between demand and supply. Previous empirical studies tried to justify the above assertion. Some scholars also studied on the challenges and possibly the prospect of agricultural marketing. Hardly was there a study on the relationship between agricultural marketing and rural farmers' financial empowerment.

The study revealed that agricultural marketing variables such as product and price have no significant relationship with rural farmer's income while place and promotion showed a significant relationship. The study showed that product produced by rural farmers has a weak negative correlation of -0.369 with their income which implies that an increase in the product produced will lead to only a less than proportionate decrease on farmers' income. The study also showed same for the price of the product which has a weak negative correlation of -0.152 with income of rural farmers. This implies that an increase in the price of the product produced will lead to only a less than proportionate decrease on farmers' income. It further revealed that the place of production has a high positive correlation of 0.956 with income of rural farmers. This implies that the location, distance, accessibility and other factors that have to do with the place factors have a very high positive relationship with financial empowerment of rural farmers and will also lead to a more than proportionate increase in their income. In the same vein, it showed that the promotion of products produced has a high positive correlation of 0.735 with income of rural farmers which implies that the method of promotion used by rural farmers has a very high positive relationship with their financial empowerment and will also lead to a more than proportionate increase in their income.

5.3 Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

- Keen attention should be paid to the distribution and marketing of agricultural produce as it showed a very high relationship with the income of rural farmers. They should consider also taking their produce to the city markets where a better price can be obtained.
- Promotion of agricultural produce should also be taken seriously as this showed a high relationship with the income of farmers. Rural farmers should adopt any promotional method at their disposal to market their produce.
- Universities and colleges in Anambra State and Nigeria at large should play a corporate social responsibility role of teaching rural farmers basic marketing skills so that farmers will be able to identify profitable markets for their produce.
- There is need for government intervention to improve the state of roads in rural areas, establish an agricultural bank specifically targeting the needs of the rural farmers so that the farmer can increase production through mechanized farming system.
- Rural farmers should form voluntary co-operative arrangements so as increase production capacity as well as to meet the cost of marketing to the local and international markets. Such cooperative arrangements will enhance knowledge sharing, resource sharing and in the process boost production capacity.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya, S. S. & Agarwal, N.L. (2010). *Agricultural Marketing in India*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
2. Alrshul, H. (1998). *Output to purpose review of DFID's crop post-harvest program Internationalsymposium*, 53-61
3. Armstrong, G. and Kotler, P (2005), *Marketing: An Introduction (7th edition)*, Upper Saddle River New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
4. Asogwa, B.C. & Okwoche, V.A. (2012). *Marketing of agricultural produce among rural farm households in nigeria: the case of sorghum marketing in benue state*. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(13), 269-277.
5. Badar, H. (2011). *Marketing of agriculture products in pakistan: theory and practice*. University of Agriculture, Faisalabad (Pakistan). Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229059737>
6. Bajrang, L. (2017). *Agricultural marketing as a catalyst for rural marketing in India: a descriptive study*. Bajrang Lal, *International Journal of Research in Management, Economics and Commerce*, 7(8), 55-60
7. Barnabas, G. (2017). *Effect of transportation on the marketing of agricultural products in Jos north*. *Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 5(2), 99-106.
8. Brown, C.P (2005), *Primary Commodity Control*, London: Oxford University



9. Canada, P. (n.d) *Financial Empowerment: Improving financial outcomes for low income household.* Retrieved from <http://www.prospercanada.org/ProsperCanada/documents/en/Financial-Empowerment-Brochure.pdf>
10. Chokera, F., Ngwenya, T., & Njovo, M. (2014). *The role of agricultural marketing on empowering rural farmers in masvingo province, zimbabwe.* *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(3), 153-163.
11. Ejionueme, N.G. & Nebo, G.N (2014), *Understanding Agricultural Marketing*, Enugu: Immaculate Publications Ltd
12. Gordon-Ashworth, F (1984). *International Commodity Control*, New York: St. Martins Press.
13. Kamara, A.B. (2004). *The impact of market access on input use and agricultural productivity: evidence from Machakos District, Kenya.* *Agrekon* 43(2).
14. Kohl, R.L. & Uhl, J.N. (2002). *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 9th edition, New Jersey: Macmillan Publishing Company.
15. Karani, K.D., & Wanjohi, J. (2017). *Factors influencing marketing of agricultural produce among small-scale farmers: A case of sorghum in Giaki location, Meru county Kenya.* *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5(8), 664-678.
16. LaLonde, B. (1977). *Distribution Logistics Grows in Importance for Marketers, But Faculty Acceptance Lags.* *Marketing News*.
17. Maponya, P., Venter, S.L., Modise, D., Heever, E.V., Kekana, V., Ngqandu A., Ntanjana, N., & Pefile, A. (2015). *Determinants of agricultural market participation in the sarahbaartman district, Eastern Cape of South Africa.* *J Hum Ecol*, 50(1), 1-9.
18. McDaniel, S.W & Hise, R.T. (1984). *Shaping the Marketing Curriculum: The CEO perspective.* *Journal of Marketing Education*, Summer, 27-32.
19. Minten, B. (1999), *Infrastructure, Market Access and Agricultural Prices: Evidence from Madagascar: Market and Structural Studies Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. 20006 U.S.A.*
20. Nchuchuwe, F.F. & Adejuwon, K.D. (2012). *The challenges of agriculture and rural development in africa: the case of Nigeria.* *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 1(3), 45-61.
21. Nebo, G.N. & Ejionueme N. (2017). *Adopting agricultural marketing approach for improving agricultural sector performance in Nigeria.* *Journal of Business and Management*, 19(4), 4-17.
22. Okuneye, P.A. (2012). *Rising Cost of Food Prices and Food Insecurity in Nigeria and Its Implication for Poverty Reduction*, *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4)
23. Onyike, J.K. & Nebo, G.N (2012). *Principles of Modern Marketing*, 2nd edition, Enugu: Precious and Queen Nigeria Ltd.
24. Pride, W.M & Ferrell, O.C (1995). *Marketing, Basic Concepts and Decisions*, 4th ed., U.S.A: Houghton Mifflin Company.
25. Prusty, S., Biswal, P., & Hathy P.R. (2013). *Regulated agricultural marketing system for economic development of Jajpur District in Orissa (India) - an empirical analysis.* *Global Journal of Management and Business Research Marketing*, 13(9), 13-33
26. Ugwuanyi, W.N & Ugwuanyi, G.O (1999). *Agricultural Financial Management and Food Marketing*, Nsukka: Johnkens and Willy Publication Ltd.
27. Uturu, C.O (2002), *Agricultural Marketing*, Nkpor-Onitsha: Baset Printing and Publishing Ltd.
28. World Bank (1994). *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, Results and the Road Ahead.* *A World Bank Policy Research Report*, Oxford University Press.
29. World Bank. (1996). *Morocco- social economic influence of rural roads. Fourth Highway project operations evaluation department.* Washington DC .World Bank.

WEBSITES

1. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Farmer>
2. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financial_independence
3. <http://www.prospercanada.org/ProsperCanada/documents/en/Financial-Empowerment-Brochure.pdf>