### DETERMINANTS OF MARKETERS' INVOLVEMENT IN CASSAVA VALUE ADDITION IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA: A GENDER PERSPECTIVE

<sup>1</sup>Ayinla, R. A., <sup>1</sup>Alao, O. T., <sup>1</sup>Adesoji, S. A., <sup>1</sup>Ayinla, R. A., and <sup>\*2</sup>Olawuyi, S. O. <sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension & Rural Development, Osun State University, Nigeria <sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria \*Correspondence: seyidolapo1704@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

This study examined the determinants of marketers' in cassava value addition in Oyo State of Nigeria. This study highlights key factors influencing cassava value addition among marketers in Oyo State, Nigeria, offering insights for inclusive growth in the sector. Data were collected from a sample of 89 marketers involved in cassava value addition across four agricultural zones using a cross-sectional design and data from interviews were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Weighted Average Index (WAI), and Factor Analysis. Findings revealed age population of marketers with a mean age of 44.5 years for marketers. Few marketers (32%) were engaged in farming as their primary occupation. Majority of marketers (78%) were married, with a significant gender imbalance women dominated cassava marketing. Most marketers had secondary and higher education of (46%) and (11%) respectively. The study revealed marketers face severe constraints especially in rural areas. Despite these challenges, cassava value addition remains a key source of income for rural households, significantly contributing to food security and employment opportunities. Overall, factor analysis reveals that, six global factors with differentiated components explained most of the variance in marketers' involvement in cassava value addition. Given the results of the study, a holistic approach tailored towards addressing these through improved infrastructure, credit access, training, and market linkages could unlock cassava's full potential to boost food security, economic growth, and inclusive development.

Keywords: Gender, Involvement, Value Addition, Marketers, Factor

### INTRODUCTION

assava (Manihot esculenta) is a crucial food crop in Nigeria, highly valued for 'its adaptability to different soils and climates, making it a dietary staple for many households (Onyediak and Adiele, 2022). Nigeria, the world's largest cassava producer, depends on this crop for food security and economic stability, especially among smallholder farmers (Otekunrin and Sawicka, 2019; Ikuemonisan et al., 2020). Cassava provides essential carbohydrates and supports rural economies by creating jobs in marketing (Darko-Koomson, Aidoo and Abdoulaye, 2020). Its versatility allows it to be marketed in form of flour, starch, and garri, contributing to dietary and income diversification (Shittu et al., 2016; Raufu et al., 2018). Africa produces 57% of global cassava, with Nigerian production increasing from 42.5 million tons in 2010 to 66 million tons in 2022 (National Agricultural Extension Research Liaison Services (NAERILS), 2022). Oyo State, a leading producer, saw production rise from 1.62 million tons in 2010 to 1.88 million tons in 2022 (NAERILS, 2022).

Cassava plays a significant role in Nigeria's economy, food security, and rural development.

As a staple crop, it provides essential calories and carbohydrates for millions, adapting well to diverse environments (Raufu et al., 2018; Coulibaly et al., 2014). Economically, cassava drives income for smallholder farmers and supports rural enterprises (Awotide et al., 2019; Otekunrin and Sawicka, 2019). However, challenges like post-harvest losses persist. Value addition has emerged as a strategy to improve cassava's market competitiveness and economic benefits (Abass et al., 2013; Darko-Koomson et al., 2020). Value addition has expanded cassava's economic impact, with products ranging from food items like garri and fufu to industrial applications. This diversification enhances the crop's economic viability, with value-added cassava products raising farmers' income by up to 300%, where women play a critical role in this growth (Okebiorun, 2024).

However, challenges like infrastructure deficits, financial constraints, and limited market information hinder the value chain (Lutta *et al.*, 2024; Ikenga *et al.*, 2024). Structural issues persist in marketing, with intermediaries capturing higher profits than producers, impacting sustainable development (Ali, 2023).

Challenges like high transaction costs further weaken market efficiency, underscoring the need for a streamlined marketing system to enhance profitability and stability in Nigeria's cassava sector (Eze et al., 2023). Despite these challenges, the study underscores gender-based challenges faced by marketers, such as funds and information, which policymakers must address to empower marginalized groups (Apata, 2019). Findings also show that valueadded cassava products can increase farmer incomes by 150-300%, underscoring the economic benefits of investments in processing infrastructure, market linkages, and financial access (Okebiorun, 2024). Several literatures both local and international revealed some findings, Abass, 2006; Babatunde et al., 2022 noted that, value addition in cassava marketing has significantly expanded both local and international market economic potential of this staple crop, opening opportunities across diverse products and industries in Nigeria. Cassava starch, an essential product with applications across industries, adds further value through refined extraction methods (Babatunde et al., 2022). Traditional foods like garri and cassava chips diversify the market, serving human and animal consumption needs (Uchechukwu-Agua et al., 2015). Industrial uses include cassava ethanol for bio-fuel and alcoholic beverages, drawing investment into the cassava sector (Raufu et al., 2018; Otunba-Payne, 2020). Biofortified cassava varieties address nutritional deficiencies by increasing vitamin A and iron, benefiting communities that rely on cassava as a dietary staple (Oparinde et al., 2016; Kolapo and Kolapo, 2021). Additionally, cassava-based composite products and snack foods cater to urban and modern consumer demands, creating new markets (Ayodeji et al., 2017; Eke-Ejiofor and Allen, 2019).

Theoretical Framework of the study was based on the theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and Social Capital Theory provides valuable insights into cassava marketers' engagement in value addition activities. *Theory of Planning Behaviour* explains marketers' behavioral intentions through attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived control. Attitudes, shaped by perceived economic benefits and risks, significantly influence marketers' investment in processing technologies (Ladele and Aderinto, 2014). Perceived behavioral control marketers' confidence in their abilities, resources, and market knowledge emerges as a critical determinant of involvement, sometimes more impactful than actual control (Taiwo and Associates, 2024).

Social Capital Theory complements TPB by highlighting how social networks facilitate resource access, information sharing, and collaboration among cassava marketers. Structural social capital, or network connections, improves access to technical knowledge and financial resources, supporting innovation (Ayodeji et al., 2017). The Relational social capital, emphasizing trust and cooperation, enables risk-sharing and problemsolving, which are essential for sustainable value addition efforts (Jayne et al., 2021). Together, these theories underscore the role of both individual perceptions and social relationships in shaping cassava value addition practices.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS Study area

The study was conducted in Oyo State, located in southwestern Nigeria, with an area of 27,249 km<sup>2</sup>. It is bounded by Ogun State to the south, Kwara State to the north, and Osun State to the east, with a projected population of 7.98 million in 2022. Agriculture is the main economic activity, with cassava being a significant crop. Oyo State's tropical climate, with distinct wet and dry seasons, supports the cultivation of cassava, yam, and other crops. The Oyo State Agricultural Development Programme (OYSADEP) aims to enhance agricultural productivity and improve farmers' livelihoods. The state is predominantly inhabited by the Yoruba ethnic group, with a strong cultural identity rooted in kinship ties (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2017).

### Sampling procedure and sample size

A four-stage sampling procedure was used to select the respondents. The first stage involved a purposive selection of two Local Government Areas (LGAs) each from the four Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) zones in the State, based on the predominance of cassava farming and processing activities. In the second stage, a simple random sampling method was

used to select two cells each across the 8 LGAs, making a total of 16 cells. Then, at the third stage, 30% of the villages in each cell was randomly selected, while at the fourth stage, 50% of the marketers involving in cassava value addition, consisting of the 25% male and 25% female from each group of the marketers involving in cassava value addition were also be proportionately. Lastly, the same technique was used to select 45 men and 45 women marketers across the selected villages, culminating in a sample of 90 actors who are marketers. This approach ensured representative coverage of the four agricultural zones and marketers across Ovo States, who are important marketers in value addition in South-west Nigeria. Based on the study objectives, important information were elicited from the selected sample size with the use of a structured questionnaire, but responses from 89 respondents were found useful for the final analyses.

### Methods of data analyses

The study applied descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, percentages, and mean values) to explore the dataset. Also, Weighted Average Index (WAI) was also used to rank the severity of the constraints facing actors' involvement in cassava value addition. Furthermore, inferential statistics such as Factor analysis was used to examine the factors influencing gender involvement in cassava value addition in the study area.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The socio-economic characteristics of marketers engaged in cassava value addition in Oyo State, Nigeria, reveal insights into the demographic, educational, and occupational landscape of this sector, providing implications for targeted policies and interventions.

The data shows that a significant proportion of cassava value addition marketers are in the 41-50 age range (49.4%), with a mean age of 44.5 years. This finding is consistent with the study by Azeez *et al.* (2021) in Oyo State. This age profile suggests that most participants are middle-aged, potentially leveraging years of experience and established business networks. However, the limited representation of marketers below 30 years underscores the need

for youth-centered policies to attract younger participants, thereby ensuring the continuity and innovation potential in cassava-related enterprises. Women constitute 61.8% of the workforce in cassava marketing activities, aligning with previous findings of the research of Olaniyi and Adewale (2014) highlighting the role of women in agricultural marketing due to their strong social networks and entrepreneurial inclinations. This gender disparity suggests entrenched gender roles and reflects the need for gender-sensitive policies that further support women's contributions while promoting skill diversification across genders for broader income stability. A predominant 87.5% of the marketers are married. This finding is consistent with the study by Ikuemonisan et al. (2020), highlighting the relevance of family networks in the cassava value addition. Married participants may rely on family labor or support systems, which suggests that policy interventions should consider family-centered approaches, particularly those that account for family labor's role in enhancing productivity. Programs that address the economic resilience of single marketers may also be beneficial in promoting equitable access to opportunities within this sector. The levels of education reveal a diverse educational profile, with a notable proportion (51.7%) having completed secondary school level schooling. This finding is consistent with research by Olarinde et al. (2020) and Elegbede et al. (2018) in that order, indicating a substantial number of marketers with secondary and even tertiary education, a trend likely associated with the increasing complexity of cassava marketing. To capitalize on this educational profile, targeted training in market dynamics, entrepreneurship, and advanced farming practices may help optimize productivity. Meanwhile, adult education initiatives could address literacy needs for actors with lower educational attainment, enhancing overall sectoral competency. The religious breakdown shows Christianity as the predominant affiliation (58.4%), followed by Islam (40.5%), with a minority practicing African Traditional Religion. This demographic distribution aligns with Azeez et al. (2022) in Oyo State with community religious composition, suggesting the importance of culturally respectful and inclusive practices.

Interventions that engage local religious institutions could be effective in promoting value addition activities, particularly in disseminating agricultural innovations and fostering community networks that support cassava marketing. Primary and secondary occupations of marketers reveal diverse livelihood strategies, with many actors balancing multiple roles. For instance, 38.2% identify cassava marketing as their primary occupation, while 42.7% report trading as a secondary occupation aligns with the study by Osakue et al. (2023). This occupational diversity emphasizes the need for flexible support systems that enable skill development across multiple sectors, enhancing income security. Cross-sectorial training in entrepreneurship and time management could enhance productivity for those juggling various income-generating activities. Household sizes predominantly fall within the 4-6-member range (67.4%), reflecting a typical family structure that supports labor needs in cassava value addition activities, this finding aligns with research by Jamiu (2022) in Ondo State, Nigeria. The role of family labor suggests potential for productivity gains, yet also calls for policies that support household-level resource management and financial literacy. Additionally, providing childcare support or incentives for family labor could alleviate pressures on households engaged in intensive labor, promoting sustained participation in the cassava sector.

#### Level of Involvement in Cassava Marketing Activities (Time of marketing)

The data in Table 2 highlights gender-based participation in cassava marketing across various market timings. The most frequent activity is "everyday" marketing (WAI = 2.4), though many females (37) and males (28) report never engaging in it, suggesting inconsistent market access due to transportation or logistical challenges (Abdullahi and Ogundeji, 2022). Seasonal marketing ranks second (WAI = 1.1), indicating that timing, such as harvest periods, influences markets (WAI = 1.0) are less frequently utilized but offer higher prices (Thakur et al., 2023). These findings suggest that limited access to regular markets affects income

stability, highlighting the need for improved infrastructure and market linkages (Ani et al., 2013).

## Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava roots measurement)

Table 3 highlights gender disparities in cassava root measurement and transportation methods. Larger-scale methods, such as "panel van" and "pick-up" (WAI = 1.3), are predominantly maledominated, reflecting men's greater control over transportation resources for bulk measurements (Usman and Akinola, 2018). In contrast, smaller methods like hand count, basket, tricycle and bus (WAI = 0.4, 0.3 and 0.2) are less frequently used, suggesting women face limitations in accessing these resources. These findings emphasize the need for improved access to transportation and measurement equipment for women, enabling greater participation in cassava marketing and boosting their economic roles (Olaosebikan, 2019).

## Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava products measurement)

Table 4 reveals gender disparities in cassava product measurement, with the "bag" method (WAI = 1.5) being most common, dominated by men, reflecting gender barriers in marketing infrastructure (Qian, 2023). Methods like "Congo" (WAI = 1.2) and "bowl" (WAI = 0.8) show more gender balance, indicating women's involvement in smaller-scale trade, limiting income potential. The "basket" method (WAI = 0.3) is rarely used. These findings highlight the need to empower women with access to equipment and training to enhance their participation in larger-scale cassava marketing and economic empowerment (UN Women, 2024).

#### Assessment of Various Values Added by the Marketers to Cassava Roots

### Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Time of marketing)

Table 5 reveals that, the analysis of cassava marketing timing in Oyo State, Nigeria reveals compelling patterns in trader engagement. Daily marketing emerged as the dominant pattern with the highest weighted average index (WAI) of 2.4, with 65 traders reporting

"Always" participating in daily trade. According to Okpara et al. (2023), this strong preference for daily marketing reflects both the perishable nature of cassava products and the consistent consumer demand in urban areas. Seasonal markets ranked second with a WAI of 1.1, showing significant but lower participation with 29 traders always participating. This pattern, as noted by Obisesan (2018), aligns with harvest cycles and peak production periods. Special cassava markets ranked third (WAI=1.0), with only 4 traders always participating but 39 often participating. Mbarga et al. (2024) suggest that these specialized markets serve as important wholesale hubs and price discovery points. The relatively low participation in five-day markets (WAI=0.8) and weekly markets (WAI=0.6) suggests a gradual shift away from traditional marketing patterns. Apeh et al. (2023) attribute this shift to changing consumer preferences and urbanization patterns that favor more frequent market access. The implications suggest that daily marketing could improve market efficiency and reduce post-harvest losses, as noted by Anyoha et al. (2023). However, Lubinga et al. (2024) emphasize the need for improved infrastructure, storage facilities, and market information networks to support frequent trading activities. The findings also highlight the importance of differentiated market development strategies to accommodate various trading patterns and trader needs.

# Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava roots measurement)

Table 6 shows that pick-up trucks as the dominant measurement method (WAI=1.3), followed by panel vans (WAI=1.1), indicating a shift toward vehicle-based measurements in cassava root trading. This preference, according to Egwuma et al. (2019), reflects the modernization of agricultural marketing systems and the need for efficient bulk transportation. Traditional measurement methods like bags (WAI=0.7), hand counting (WAI=0.5), and baskets (WAI=0.5) show lower adoption rates. Haggblade et al. (2012) attribute this to increasing commercialization and the need for standardized measurement systems. The lowest ranked methods, tricycles and buses (both WAI=0.3), suggest limited utility of these

transport modes for measurement purposes. The implications are significant for market development. Ibana et al. (2009) argued that vehicle-based measurements could lead to more standardized pricing systems and improved market integration. However, Beban and Gironde (2023) cautioned about potential marginalization of smaller traders who cannot afford vehicular transportation. The findings suggest a need for balanced market development policies that promote standardization while ensuring inclusivity. Awerije (2014) equally recommended developing hybrid measurement systems that accommodate both modern and traditional methods to ensure market participation across all trader categories.

# Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava product measurement)

Table 7 shows that bags as the predominant measurement unit for cassava products with the highest WAI of 1.5, followed by congo measurements (WAI=1.2). According to Awoyale et al. (2017), this preference for standardized units indicates a significant move toward formalized trading systems. The high adoption of bag measurements, with 44 traders always using this method, suggests its reliability and acceptance in the market system. Bowls and paint bowls share the third position (WAI=0.8), indicating moderate adoption of these smaller measurement units. Mbarga et al. (2024) note that these intermediate-sized measurements are particularly important for retail trade and smallscale transactions. The similar WAI for both measurement types suggests their complementary roles in the market system. Traditional measurements like wraps (WAI=0.4) and baskets (WAI=0.2) show limited usage, with only 9 and 4 traders respectively always using these methods. Apeh et al. (2023) attribute this decline to increasing market integration and the need for consistent measurement standards across different markets. The low adoption of traditional measurements reflects a broader shift toward standardization in agricultural marketing.

The implications of these measurement patterns are substantial for market development. According to Adeniyi et al. (2023), standardized measurements facilitate better price comparison and market efficiency. However, the transition from traditional to standardized measurements requires careful management to ensure market inclusivity and preserve cultural practices where appropriate.

### Perceived Benefits of Involvement in Cassava Value Addition (Cassava Marketing)

Table 8 highlights the benefits analysis demonstrates income generation as the primary advantage of cassava marketing (WAI=2.9), with 80 traders (49 female, 31 male) reporting it as a consistent benefit. According to Ewugi and Ilyasu (2024), this strong economic benefit particularly impacts women who often dominate cassava marketing activities. Poverty reduction ranks second (WAI=2.4), while increased social status and recognition rank third (WAI=2.1). Prince et al. (2023) note that these benefits extend beyond economic gains to include social empowerment. Employment opportunities, skill development, and community harmony share the fourth position (WAI=2.0), indicating their significant but secondary importance. The genderdifferentiated responses revealed interesting patterns, with women generally reporting higher participation in daily marketing activities. Agada et al. (2018) suggest that this gender dimension has important implications for market development and policy formulation. The lower ranking of government revenue generation (WAI=1.5) indicates that traders prioritize personal and community benefits over broader institutional impacts. These findings imply the need for comprehensive market development strategies that enhance both economic and social benefits. Masamha et al. (2019) emphasize the importance of gender-sensitive policies and support systems to maximize these benefits across all participant categories.

### Factors Associated with Marketers' Involvement in Cassava Value Addition

The data in Tables 9a and 9b present the results of a factor analysis conducted on marketers' involvement in cassava value addition. The factor analysis identifies the underlying factors that explain the relationships between the observed variables in terms of the marketers' involvement in cassava value addition.

As shown in the results, the analysis also retained 6 factors (Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, Factor 4, Factor 5 and Factor 6) which are jointly significant, suggesting that these six factors account for most of the variability in marketers' involvement in the cassava value addition activities. Given the results, Factor 1 has the highest eigenvalue (6.04763), explaining 33.60% of the total variance. Factor 2 also has an eigenvalue of 2.29956, explaining 12.78% of the variance, while Factor 3 has an eigenvalue of 1.44766, explaining 8.04% of the variance. In the same vein, a factor 4 has an eigenvalue of 1.26013, explaining 0.7% of the variance, while Factor 5 also has an eigenvalue of 1.18425, explaining 6.58% of the variance. The findings also revealed Factor 6 with an eigenvalue of 1.10811, which also explains about 6.16% of the variance in the marketers' involvement in cassava value addition. Given the difference column in Table 4.51a, showing the difference between the eigenvalues of consecutive factors which assesses how much information each additional factor contributes. the findings revealed that the difference decreases sharply after the first two factors, indicating that subsequent factors explain less variance. Also, the six retained factors cumulatively explain 74.15% of the variance, meaning that the retained factors account for most of the relationships in the data, by summarizing the involvement of marketers in cassava value addition without losing much information. Most importantly, the analysis returned a chi-square test value is 897.09, with the p-value of 0.0000. This test shows that the factor model fits the data significantly better than a model that assumes independence between the variables.

### Constraints against Marketers' Involvement in Cassava Value Addition

Table 10 highlights challenges in cassava marketing, showing both common and genderspecific issues. The constraints analysis identifies inadequate access to credit and finance as the primary challenge (WAI=2.1), with 52 traders (23 female, 29 male) reporting it as very severe.

Ugwu et al. (2024) noted that financial constraints particularly affect small-scale traders and women in the market system.

Market regulation inadequacies rank second (WAI=1.9), followed by high competition (WAI=1.8). Poor transportation and storage facilities share the fourth position (WAI=1.6), indicating significant infrastructure challenges. Akinnagbe (2010) emphasized how these constraints limit market efficiency and trader profitability. Gender-based discrimination (WAI=1.1) and lack of market information (WAI=0.9) show lower but notable severity. Mwakanyamale et al. (2021) suggested that these structural barriers particularly affect women's participation and success in cassava marketing. The relatively low ranking of limited market access (WAI=0.6) indicates that physical market access might be less problematic than other constraints. This suggests the need for multi-faceted interventions. Manganyi et al. (2023) also recommended improving access to financial services, strengthening market regulations, and developing infrastructure. Also, gendersensitive policies and capacity-building programs are crucial for addressing both economic and social constraints in the cassava marketing system.

### CONCLUSION

Cassava value addition in Oyo State, Nigeria, involves a range of actors who facilitate the crop's journey from farm to market. Despite providing substantial income and employment opportunities, especially in rural areas, this sector faces significant challenges. Key issues include limited financial access, labor shortages and high costs of value-added processes, gender disparities, and inadequate infrastructure. The predominance of small-scale actors in cassava marketing reflects the sector's smallholder roots. To scale these operations, policies that improve access to gender-friendly equipment and financial inclusion are essential. Addressing gender inequalities in resource access and opportunities is crucial for enhancing equity and efficiency in the value chain.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

To enhance the cassava sector in Oyo State, several key recommendations are proposed for implementations by the government and nongovernmental organizations who are saddled with agri-food sector development. First, infrastructure improvements, such as investments in rural roads and fuel stability, will reduce transportation costs and improve market access, thereby increasing profitability for cassava producers. Financial inclusion is also critical, with targeted loan products and the support of rural microfinance institutions to provide small-scale farmers with better access to capital.

Gender-sensitive policies should be implemented to reduce disparities in access to credit, equipment, and markets, ensuring women can equally benefit from sector growth. Strengthening cooperatives will improve market and resource access, while training in financial management and technical skills will empower farmers to make informed decisions.

Finally, market stabilization efforts, such as price stabilization and enhanced market information systems should be implemented by the government. This will protect cassava industry, especially the cassava producers from price fluctuations. Together, these recommendations will foster a resilient, inclusive, and profitable cassava sector in Oyo State, promoting sustainable growth and improving the livelihoods of all stakeholders involved.

### REFERENCES

- Abass, A. B., Awoyale, W., Alenkhe, B., Malu, N., Asiru, B. W., Manyong, V., and Sanginga, N. (2013). Off-grid cassava processing plants in Tanzania: A costefficient approach to add value and boost smallholder competitiveness. Food Chain, 3(1), 52-66.
- Abass, A., Awoyale, W., Jamal, M., Castella, G., Ndunguru, G., Taleon, V..., and Kleih, U. (2019). The influence of storage on the quality and acceptability of dried cassava products. Acta Horticulturae, 1249, 145-152.
- Abdullahi, I. and Ogundeji, S.T. (2022). Rural and Urban Marketing Challenges and their Impact on Nigerian Economy.
- Adeniyi, V.A., Akangbe, J.A., Kolawole, A.E., Ayeni, M.D. and Olorunfemi, D.O. (2023).
  Women cassava processors' livelihood; implications for improved processing technology usage in Nigeria. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(1), 2191898.

- Agada, M.O., Onuche, F.I. and Mbah, E.N. (2018). Gender participation and constraints in cassava production, processing and marketing in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Gender and Women's Studies*, 6(1), 79-87.
- Akinnagbe, O.M. (2010). Constraints and strategies towards improving cassava production and processing in Enugu north agricultural zone of Enugu State, Nigeria.
- Ali, S.M., Sayem, A., Ali Ashraf, M.D and Sanjoy, K.M. (2023). Adoption in supply chains implication for sustainability in the post – pandemic era. *Journal of engineering*, 183, 109515.
- Ani, S.O., Agbugba, I.K. and Baiyegunhi, L.J. (2013). Processing and marketing of selected cassava products in south-east Nigeria. *Journal of Economics*, 4(2), 105-111.
- Anyoha, N.P.O., Udemba, C., Ogbonnaya, A. and Okoroma, E. (2023). Causes of Cassava Post- Harvest Losses Among Farmers in Imo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 27(2), 73-79.
- Apata, T.G. (2019). Analysis of cassava value chain in Nigeria: pro-poor approach and gender perspective. *International Journal of Value Chain Management*, *10* (3), 219-237.
- Apeh, C.C., Ugwuoti, O.P. and Apeh, A.C. (2023). Analysis of the consumption patterns of cassava food products amongst rural households in Imo State, Nigeria. *Ghana Journal of Agricultural Science*, 58(1), 100-110.
- Awerije, B. (2014). Exploring the potential of cassava for agricultural growth and economic Development in Nigeria.
- Awotide, D. O., Diagne, A., Wiredu, A. N., and Oluwatayo, I. B. (2019). Impact of access to complementary information and communication technologies on the value chain of cassava in rural Nigeria. Information Development, 35(2), 315-331.
- Awoyale, W., Abass, A.B., Ndavi, M., Maziya-Dixon, B. and Sulyok, M. (2017). Assessment of the potential industrial applications of commercial dried cassava products in Nigeria. *Journal of food measurement and characterization*, 11, 598-609.

- Ayodeji, O., Remi, A., Adebayo, S. B., and Ayodeji, D. K. (2017). Assessment of profitability and efficiency of cassava production among government and nongovernment assisted farmers association in Osun State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Rural Development (AFJRD), 2*(1978-2017-1915): 225-233.
- Azeez, F.A., Úsman, J.M., Obadimu, O.O., Mukarumbwa, P. and Kabir, G.B. (2021).
  Women Involvement in Cassava Value Chain among Cassava Processors and Marketers in Afijio Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Russian Journal* of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences, 110(2), pp.103-109.
- Babatunde, A. A., Yusuf, S. A., Omonona, B. T. and Obi-Egbedi, O. (2022). Profitability Analysis among Actors of High-Quality Cassava Flour in South West Nigeria. *International Journal of Sustainable Agricultural Research*, 9(3): 129-139. DOI: 10.18488/ijsar.v9i3.3089.
- Balogun, I., Garner, E., Amer, P., Fennessy, P., Teeken, B., Olaosebikan, O., Abolore, B., Madu, T., Okoye, B., Santos, B. and Byrne, T. (2022). From traits to typologies: Piloting new approaches to profiling trait preferences along the cassava value chain in Nigeria. *Crop Science*, 62(1), pp.259-274.
- Beban, A. and Gironde, C. (2023). Surviving cassava: smallholder farmer strategies for coping with market volatility in Cambodia, *Journal of Land Use Science*, 18(1), 109-127.
- Coulibaly, O., Arinloye, A.D., Faye, M. and Abdoulaye, T. (2014). Regional cassava value chains analysis in West Africa. *Case study of Nigeria*.
- Darko-Koomson, S., Aidoo, R. and Abdoulaye, T. (2020). Analysis of cassava value chain in Ghana: implications for upgrading smallholder supply systems. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies*, 10(2), pp.217-235.
- Donkor, E., Onakuse, S., Bogue, J. and de Los Rios Carmenado, I. (2018). "Promoting value addition among farmers in the cassava food value chain in Nigeria". *British Food Journal*, 120: 2047-2065.

- Egwuma, H., Muhammed, A.E., Ojeleye, O.A., Oladimeji, Y.U. and Hassan, A.A. (2019). Analysis of structure and efficiency of cassava marketing in Ado-Ekiti Local Government Area of Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 27(2), 62-69.
- Ejiofor, E.J. and Allen, J.E. (2019). The Physicochemical and Pasting Properties of High Quality Cassava Flour and Tiger Nut Composite Blends in Chin-chin Production. *American Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 7(1): 13-21. DOI: 10.12691/ajfst-7-1-3
- Elegbede, V., Dipeolu, A. and Shittu, A. (2018). Value chain analysis of cassava products in Ogun state, Nigeria. Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Creative Arts, 13(1), 75-88.
- Ewugi, M.S. and Ilyasu, A.Y. (2024). Women in Cassava Processing and Marketing in North Central Nigeria: Are they any Happier?. *Lapai Journal of Economics*, 8(1), 301-309.
- Eze, E.U., Osuji, E.E., Enyia, C.O., Nwose, R.N., Ugochukwu, G.U., Tim-Ashama, A.C., Odor, A.H., Nwogu, V.C., Orjib, J.E. and Nwaizuzu-Daniel, J.C. (2023).
  Efficiency of Marketing Systems of Cassava in Southeast, Nigeria. *Emerging Issues in Agricultural Sciences*, p.44.
- Ezeibe, A.B., Edafiogho, D.O., Okonkwo, N.A. and Okide, C.C. (2015). Gender differences and challenges in cassava production and processing in Abia State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 10(22), 2259-2266.
- Haggblade, S., Andersson Djurfeldt, A., Banda Nyirenda, D., Bergman Lodin, J., Brimer, L., Chiona, M., Chitundu, M., Chiwona-Karltun, L., Cuambe, C., Dolislager, M. and Donovan, C. (2012). Cassava commercialization in Southeastern Africa. Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies, 2(1), 4-40.
- Ibana, S.E., Nkang, N.M. and Ezedinma, C. (2009). Price transmission and market integration: A test of the central market hypothesis of geographical markets for cassava products in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, *15*(3-4).

- Ikenga, V., Ekene, O.G., and Gbigbi, T.M. (2024). Prospects and challenges of agricultural financing in Nigeria: A review. GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 18(3), 388-399.
- Ikuemonisan, E.S., Mafimisebi, T.E., Ajibefun, I. and Adenegan, K. (2020). Cassava production in Nigeria: trends, instability and decomposition analysis (1970–2018). *Heliyon*, 6(10).
- Iyanda, J.O., Afolami, C.A., Obayelu, A.E. and Ladebo, O.J. (2014). Social capital and access to credit among cassava farming households in Ogun State, Nigeria. Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, 3(2), pp.175-196.
- Jamiu, W.M. (2022). Value Chain Analysis of Palm Oil in Ondo State, Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Bayero University Kano, Nigeria.
- Kolapo, A. and Kolapo, A.J. (2021). Welfare and productivity impact of adoption of biofortified cassava by smallholder farmers in Nigeria. *Cogent Food and Agriculture*, 7:1: 1886662. DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2021.1886</u> <u>662</u>
- Ladele, A.A. and Aderinto, A. (2014). Effectiveness of Market Support Services on Productivity of Cassava Farmers in South Western Nigeria. Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, 12(1), 1-17.
- Lubinga, M.H., Zondo, B., Manganyi, B. and Ningi, T. (2024). Determinants of household participation in the cassava value-chain in South Africa. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(12), 8192.
- Lutta, A.I., Bößner, S., Johnson, F.X., Virgin, I., Trujillo, M. and Osano, P. (2024). Transnational innovation systems for bioeconomy: insights from cassava value chains in East Africa. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8, 1205795.
- Masamha, B., Uzokwe, V.N., Ntagwabira, F.E., Gabagambi, D. and Mamiro, P. (2019). Gender influence on participation in cassava value chains in smallholder farming sectors: evidence from Kigoma region, Tanzania. *Experimental Agriculture*, 55(1), 57-72.

- Mbarga Evouna, J.S., Molua, E.L., Djomo Choumbou, R.F. and KemeniKambiet, P.L. (2024). Structure and performance of cassava markets: challenges of food security and connecting small farmers to markets in Cameroon. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8, 1353565.
- Mwakanyamale, D.F., Baumung, L., Cole, S.M., Webber, A., Saleh, N. and Kapinga, R. (2021). Gender barriers and success factors that shape women's involvement in and benefits from cassava seed production businesses in Tanzania.
- National Agricultural Extension Research Liaison Services (NAERILS) (2022). Cassava trend production in Nigeria (online) www.naerls.gov.ng
- Obisesan, A.A. (2018). Market participation and food security of cassava farmers in rural South West Nigeria. Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development, 47(1), 57-64.
- Okebiorun, E.O. (2024). Economic Analysis of Cassava Value Chain among Farmers in Ilesa West Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Business and Management Sciences*, 5(1), 97-109.
- Okpara, B.O., Ahamefula, B.A., Obasi, I.O. and Udokure, U.J. (2023). Analysis of Cassava Product Marketing in Abia State, Nigeria. *Nigeria Agricultural Journal*, *54*(2), 88-93.
- Olaomo, O.K. (2021). Analysis of gender participation in the marketing and processing phases of the cassava value chain in Nigeria (Master's thesis, Auburn University).
- Olaosebikan, O., Abdulrazaq, B., Owoade, D., Ogunade, A., Aina, O., Ilona, P., Muheebwa, A., Teeken, B., Iluebbey, P., Kulakow, P. and Bakare, M. (2019). Gender-based constraints affecting biofortified cassava production, processing and marketing among men and women adopters in Oyo and Benue States, Nigeria. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology*, 105, 17-27.
- Olarinde, L.O., Abass, A.B., Abdoulaye, T., Adepoju, A.A., Adio, M.O., Fanifosi, E.G. and Wasiu, A. (2020). The influence of social networking on food security status of cassava farming households in Nigeria. *Sustainability*, *12*(13), 5420.

- Oparinde, A., Abdoulaye, T., Birol, E., Asare-Marfo, D., Kulakow, P. and Ilona, P. (2016). A Technical Review of Modern Cassava Technology Adoption in Nigeria (1985–2013): Trends, Challenges, and Opportunities, HarvestPlus Working Paper 23. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). A v a i l a b l e from: http://ebrary.ifpri.org/cdm/ref/collection/p 15738coll2/id/130268.
- Osakue, M.I., Emokaro, C.O. and Ossai, C.O. (2023). Analysis of cassava tuber marketing in rural and urban markets in Edo South agro-ecological zone, Edo State, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Agricultural Studies*, 7(1), pp.10-19.
- Otekunrin, O.A. and Sawicka, B. (2019). Cassava, a 21st century staple crop: How can Nigeria harness its enormous trade potentials? *Acta Scientific Agriculture*, 3(8), 194-202.
- Otunba-Payne, M. R. (2020). Mechanized cassava processing system for lowresource communities. *The Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power*, 142(3).
- Parmar, A., Sturm, B. and Hensel, O. (2017). Crops that feed the world: Production and improvement of cassava for food, feed, and industrial uses. *Food Security*, 9, 907-927.
- Prince, A.I., Ehi, O.E., Brown-Ofoeme, M.N., Collins, O. and Alobele, I.A. (2023). Social Policies and Poverty Reduction in Africa: A Nigeria-centered Perspective. *IIARD J. Human. Soc. Policy*, 9(1), 49-77.
- Qian, C. (2023). Lifting barriers to genderresponsive infrastructure. Green Policy P l a t f o r m . A v a i l a b l e a t : https://www.greenpolicyplatform.org/blo g/lifting-barriers-gender-responsiveinfrastructure. (Accessed September 26, 2024).
- Quisumbing, A., Heckert, J., Faas, S., Ramani, G., Raghunathan, K., and Malapit, H. (2021). Pro-WEAI for Market Inclusion Study Team Hazel Malapit Jessica Heckert Sarah Eissler Simone Faas Elena Martinez Emily Myers Audrey Pereira Agnes Quisumbing Catherine Ragasa Kalyani Raghunathan Deborah Rubin Greg Seymour, 2021. Women's empowerment and gender equality in agricultural value chains: evidence from four countries in Asia and Africa. *Food Security*, 13, pp.1101-1124.

- Raufu, M.O., Adesina, B.A., Abdulazeez, A.A. and Marizu, J.T. (2018). Cassava production and options of sales outlets in Oyo State. *Int. J. Res. Stud*, 5(4), pp.175-181.
- Shittu, T. A., Sanusi, R. A., Barriga, S. L., and Akinloye, A. T. (2016). Bread from composite cassava-wheat flour: I. Effect of cassava variety and nitrogen fertilizer on the chemical and loaf qualities. Food Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 6(1), 1-18.
- Thakur, P., Mehta, P., Devi, C., Sharma, P., Singh, K.K., Yadav, S., Lal, P., Raghav, Y.S., Kapoor, P. and Mishra, P. (2023).
  Marketing performance and factors influencing farmers' choice for agricultural output marketing channels: the case of garden pea (Pisum sativum) in India. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 7, 1270121.

- Uchechukwu, -Agua, A.D., Caleb, O.J., and Opara, U.L. (2015). Post harvest handling and storage of fresh cassava root and products: A review. Journal of food and Bioprocess Technology 8, 729-748, 2015.
- Ugwu, A., Igweh, A., Odoh, J. and Ezeaku, G. (2024). Access and usage of formal financial services among small-scale cassava farmers for productivity in Enugu state, Nigeria. *Tarım Ekonomisi Dergisi*, *30*(2), 183-196.
- USAID. (2021). Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment 2020 Policy. Available at: https://www.marketlinks.org/sites/default/ fi l e s / m e d i a / fi l e / 2 0 2 1 -01/USAID\_GenderEquality\_Policy\_MT\_ WEB\_single\_508.pdf. (Accessed September 22, 2024).
- Usman, B.A. and Akinola, O. (2018). Gender differentials in transportation characteristics of students of tertiary education institutions in Ilorin, Nigeria. *Ife Research Publications in Geography*, 15(1), 91-106.

| Variable                    | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|------|
| Age                         |           |            | 44.5 |
| < 30                        | 7         | 7.9        |      |
| 31-40                       | 19        | 21.4       |      |
| 41-50                       | 44        | 49.4       |      |
| Above 50                    | 19        | 21.4       |      |
| Gender                      |           |            |      |
| Female                      | 55        | 61.8       |      |
| Male                        | 34        | 38.2       |      |
| Marital Status              |           | 0012       |      |
| Single                      | 1         | 6.7        |      |
| Married                     | 78        | 87.5       |      |
| Separated                   | 2         | 2.3        |      |
| Divorced                    | 0         | 0.0        |      |
| Widowed                     | 3         | 3.4        |      |
| Level of Education          |           |            |      |
| No formal Education         | 9         | 10.1       |      |
| Primary Incomplete          | 5         | 5.6        |      |
| Primary Complete            | 8         | 9.0        |      |
| Secondary Incomplete        | 10        | 11.2       |      |
| Secondary Complete          | 46        | 51.7       |      |
| Tertiary                    | 11        | 12.4       |      |
| Religion                    |           |            |      |
| Christianity                | 52        | 58.4       |      |
| Islam                       | 36        | 40.5       |      |
| African Traditional         | 1         | 1.1        |      |
| Primary Occupation          | <u> </u>  |            |      |
| Farming                     | 2 7       | 36.0       |      |
| Farming<br>Civil Service    | 32        |            |      |
|                             | 7         | 7.9        |      |
| Cassava Harvesting          | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Transporting        | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Processing          | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Marketing           | 34        | 38.2       |      |
| Trading                     | 16        | 18.0       |      |
| Secondary Occupation        |           |            |      |
| Farming                     | 14        | 1 5.7      |      |
| Civil Service               | 1         | 1.1        |      |
| Cassava Harvesting          | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Transporting        | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Processing          | -         | -          |      |
| Cassava Marketing           | 36        | 40.1       |      |
| Trading                     | 38        | 42.7       |      |
| Household Size              |           |            | 5.1  |
| < 3                         | 11        | 12.4       |      |
| 4-6                         | 60        | 67.4       |      |
| 7-9                         | 18        | 20.2       |      |
| Above 10                    | -         | -          |      |
| Source: Data analysis, 2024 |           | $\frown$   |      |
|                             |           | -(349)     |      |

### Table 1: Socio-Economic Features of the Respondents (Marketers) (N = 89)

| Time of<br>marketing         | Alway  | vs (3) | Often (2) |      | Often (2) Rarely (1) Never (0) |      |        | Often (2) Rarely (1) Never (0) |     | Weight | Weight WAI      |  |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|------|--------------------------------|------|--------|--------------------------------|-----|--------|-----------------|--|
| marketing                    | Female | Male   | Female    | Male | Female                         | Male | Female | Male                           | -   |        |                 |  |
| Everyday                     | 37     | 28     | 6         | 2    | 4                              | 0    | 8      | 4                              | 215 | 2.4    | $1^{st}$        |  |
| Seasonal<br>market           | 11     | 18     | 2         | 1    | 4                              | 1    | 38     | 14                             | 98  | 1.1    | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |  |
| Special<br>cassava<br>market | 4      | 0      | 15        | 24   | 2                              | 0    | 34     | 10                             | 92  | 1.0    | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |  |
| Five days                    | 10     | 1      | 2         | 4    | 9                              | 19   | 34     | 10                             | 73  | 0.8    | $4^{th}$        |  |
| Weekly<br>basis              | 4      | 0      | 4         | 2    | 15                             | 18   | 32     | 14                             | 57  | 0.6    | 5 <sup>th</sup> |  |

### Table 2: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Time of marketing)

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

| Table 3: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava roots measurement) |        |       |        |      |        |       |        |      |        |     |          |
|---|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|-----|----------|
| Measurement of  | Alway  | s (3) | Often  | (2)  | Rarel  | y (1) | Never  | (0)  |        |     |          |
| cassava roots   | Female | Male  | Female | Male | Female | Male  | Female | Male | Weight | WAI | Rank     |
| Panel van   | 12     | 23    | 6      | 0    | 0      | 1     | 37     | 10   | 118    | 1.3 | $1^{st}$ |
| Pick up   | 7      | 3     | 12     | 22   | 3      | 0     | 33     | 9    | 113    | 1.3 | $1^{st}$ |
| Bag   | 13     | 3     | 6      | 2    | 2      | 2     | 34     | 27   | 68     | 0.8 | $3^{rd}$ |
| Hand count  | 11     | 0     | 3      | 1    | 2      | 1     | 39     | 32   | 44     | 0.4 | $4^{th}$ |
| Basket  | 9      | 4     | 0      | 0    | 4      | 0     | 42     | 30   | 43     | 0.4 | $4^{th}$ |
| Tricycle  | 2      | 1     | 3      | 3    | 8      | 1     | 42     | 29   | 30     | 0.3 | $6^{th}$ |

8

2

42

31

24

0.2

 $7^{\text{th}}$ 

Table 3: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava roots measurement)

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

3

0

2

Bus

| Measurement            | Alway  | ys (3) | Often  | n (2) | Rarel  | y (1) | Never  | · (0) |        |     |                 |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| of cassava<br>products | Female | Male   | Female | Male  | Female | Male  | Female | Male  | Weight | WAI | Rank            |
| Bag                    | 20     | 24     | 1      | 0     | 0      | 1     | 34     | 9     | 135    | 1.5 | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| Congo                  | 24     | 7      | 2      | 1     | 6      | 2     | 23     | 24    | 107    | 1.2 | $2^{nd}$        |
| Bowl                   | 2      | 1      | 7      | 21    | 6      | 1     | 40     | 11    | 74     | 0.8 | $3^{rd}$        |
| Paint bowl             | 7      | 5      | 6      | 1     | 7      | 17    | 35     | 11    | 74     | 0.8 | $3^{rd}$        |
| Wraps                  | 8      | 1      | 2      | 2     | 3      | 2     | 42     | 29    | 40     | 0.4 | $5^{\text{th}}$ |
| Basket                 | 3      | 0      | 4      | 0     | 2      | 3     | 47     | 30    | 22     | 0.3 | $6^{\text{th}}$ |

Table 4: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava products measurement)

1

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

|                        |            |           |            | N. (0)    | <b>W</b> <sup>1</sup> | XX7A T |                 |
|------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Time of marketing      | Always (3) | Often (2) | Rarely (1) | Never (0) | Weight                | WAI    | Rank            |
| Everyday               | 65         | 8         | 4          | 12        | 215                   | 2.4    | 1 st            |
| Seasonal market        | 29         | 3         | 5          | 52        | 98                    | 1.1    | $2^{nd}$        |
| Special cassava market | 4          | 39        | 2          | 44        | 92                    | 1.0    | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Five days              | 11         | 6         | 28         | 44        | 73                    | 0.8    | $4^{\text{th}}$ |
| Weekly basis           | 4          | 6         | 33         | 46        | 57                    | 0.6    | $5^{\text{th}}$ |

### Table 5: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Time of marketing)

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

| Table 6: Level of in | volvement | in cassava | marketing ac | tivities (Cassava roots measurement) |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Measurement of       | Always    | Often      | Rarely       | Never                                |

| Measurement of cassava roots | Always<br>(3) | Often<br>(2) | Rarely<br>(1) | Never<br>(0) | Weight | WAI | Rank            |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| Pick up                      | 35            | 6            | 1             | 47           | 118    | 1.3 | $1^{st}$        |
| Panel van                    | 10            | 34           | 3             | 42           | 101    | 1.1 | $2^{nd}$        |
| Bag                          | 16            | 8            | 3             | 61           | 67     | 0.7 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Hand count                   | 13            | 0            | 4             | 71           | 43     | 0.5 | $4^{\text{th}}$ |
| Basket                       | 11            | 4            | 3             | 71           | 44     | 0.5 | $4^{\text{th}}$ |
| Tricycle                     | 3             | 6            | 9             | 71           | 30     | 0.3 | $6^{\text{th}}$ |
| Bus                          | 2             | 4            | 10            | 73           | 24     | 0.3 | $6^{\text{th}}$ |

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

#### Table 7: Level of involvement in cassava marketing activities (Cassava product measurement)

| Measurement of cassava products | Always<br>(3) | Often<br>(2) | Rarely<br>(1) | Never<br>(0) | Weight | WAI | Rank            |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| Bag                             | 44            | 1            | 1             | 43           | 135    | 1.5 | $1^{st}$        |
| Congo                           | 31            | 3            | 8             | 47           | 107    | 1.2 | $2^{nd}$        |
| Bowl                            | 12            | 7            | 24            | 46           | 74     | 0.8 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Paint bowl                      | 3             | 28           | 7             | 51           | 72     | 0.8 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Wraps                           | 9             | 4            | 5             | 71           | 40     | 0.4 | $5^{th}$        |
| Basket                          | 4             | 2            | 5             | 77           | 21     | 0.2 | 6 <sup>th</sup> |

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

#### Table 8: Benefits of Involvement in Cassava Marketing

| Benefits of  | Alway           | vs (3) | Often  | (2)  | Rarely | v (1) | Never  | · (0) |        |     |                 |
|--|-----------------|--------|--------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| Involvement in<br>Cassava<br>Marketing                               | Female          | Male   | Female | Male | Female | Male  | Female | Male  | Weight | WAI | Rank            |
| Income generation  | 49              | 31     | 4      | 2    | 0      | 1     | 2      | 0     | 253    | 2.8 | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| Reduced poverty  | 33              | 11     | 16     | 23   | 0      | 0     | 6      | 0     | 210    | 2.4 | $2^{nd}$        |
| Increase social<br>status and<br>recognition within<br>the community | 22              | 28     | 6      | 0    | 20     | 5     | 7      | 1     | 187    | 2.1 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Employment opportunity   | 26              | 28     | 0      | 1    | 11     | 3     | 18     | 2     | 178    | 2.0 | $4^{\text{th}}$ |
| It promotes<br>harmony among<br>women and men                        | 20              | 9      | 8      | 20   | 23     | 5     | 4      | 0     | 171    | 2.0 | 4 <sup>th</sup> |
| Skill development & entrepreneurship                                 | <sup>2</sup> 17 | 9      | 14     | 20   | 21     | 5     | 3      | 0     | 172    | 2.0 | $4^{th}$        |
| It promotes gender equality  | 16              | 6      | 12     | 21   | 22     | 5     | 5      | 2     | 159    | 1.8 | $7^{th}$        |
| Generation of<br>revenue to<br>government                            | 10              | 6      | 18     | 22   | 1      | 1     | 26     | 5     | 130    | 1.5 | 8 <sup>th</sup> |

Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024

| Factor    | Eigenvalue | Difference | Proportion | Cumulative |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Factor 1  | 6.04763    | 3.74807    | 0.3360     | 0.3360     |
| Factor 2  | 2.29956    | 0.85190    | 0.1278     | 0.4637     |
| Factor 3  | 1.44766    | 0.18753    | 0.0804     | 0.5442     |
| Factor 4  | 1.26013    | 0.07588    | 0.0700     | 0.6142     |
| Factor 5  | 1.18425    | 0.07614    | 0.0658     | 0.6800     |
| Factor 6  | 1.10811    | 0.16198    | 0.0616     | 0.7415     |
| Factor 7  | 0.94613    | 0.15554    | 0.0526     | 0.7941     |
| Factor 8  | 0.79058    | 0.15229    | 0.0439     | 0.8380     |
| Factor 9  | 0.63829    | 0.11617    | 0.0355     | 0.8735     |
| Factor 10 | 0.52212    | 0.11536    | 0.0290     | 0.9025     |
| Factor 11 | 0.40676    | 0.03646    | 0.0226     | 0.9251     |
| Factor 12 | 0.37030    | 0.08996    | 0.0206     | 0.9456     |
| Factor 13 | 0.28034    | 0.06742    | 0.0156     | 0.9612     |
| Factor 14 | 0.21292    | 0.04227    | 0.0118     | 0.9730     |
| Factor 15 | 0.17065    | 0.04487    | 0.0095     | 0.9825     |
| Factor 16 | 0.12578    | 0.01434    | 0.0070     | 0.9895     |
| Factor 17 | 0.11144    | 0.03407    | 0.0062     | 0.9957     |
| Factor 18 | 0.07737    | -          | 0.0043     | 1.0000     |

 Table 9a: Factors Analysis - Marketers' Involvement in Cassava Value Addition

Retained factors = 6; Number of observation = 87 ; LR test: independent vs. saturated: chi<sup>2</sup> (153) = 897.09; Prob>chi<sup>2</sup> = 0.0000

Source: Data analysis, 2024

| Table 9b: Factors Loadings | - Marketers' | Involvement in | Cassava | Value Addition |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------------|
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------------|

| Variable               | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Factor 6 | Uniqueness |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Everyday market        | 0.0476   | -0.6569  | 0.5543   | 0.3054   | 0.2007   | 0.1673   | 0.0975     |
| Five days market       | 0.5943   | 0.3689   | 0.0477   | -0.1729  | -0.2817  | 0.2336   | 0.3447     |
| Weekly basis           | 0.5127   | 0.2541   | -0.2968  | 0.4508   | 0.0338   | 0.1831   | 0.3466     |
| Special cassava market | 0.8594   | 0.0857   | 0.098    | -0.1258  | -0.0618  | 0.0183   | 0.2245     |
| Seasonal market        | 0.7481   | -0.3053  | 0.0095   | 0.2156   | 0.1062   | -0.1823  | 0.2561     |
| Hand count-root        | -0.3508  | -0.0824  | 0.2144   | -0.2636  | 0.6572   | 0.4298   | 0.1381     |
| Basket-root            | -0.1719  | 0.5201   | 0.0463   | 0.4763   | 0.4383   | -0.3786  | 0.1355     |
| Bag-root               | -0.4829  | 0.0913   | 0.3846   | 0.0445   | -0.4952  | 0.0629   | 0.3594     |
| Tricycle-root          | 0.1761   | 0.6182   | 0.2199   | -0.2813  | -0.0691  | 0.0213   | 0.4542     |
| Bus-root               | 0.2072   | 0.6548   | 0.414    | -0.1657  | 0.2105   | -0.0944  | 0.2762     |
| Panel van-root         | 0.7885   | 0.0479   | 0.1786   | -0.2071  | 0.1131   | 0.092    | 0.28       |
| Pick-up-root           | 0.8726   | -0.1731  | 0.0604   | 0.5002   | -0.0696  | 0.1422   | 0.1773     |
| Wraps-products         | -0.2541  | 0.0263   | 0.5219   | 0.3534   | -0.2969  | -0.2079  | 0.406      |
| Congo-products         | -0.6429  | 0.0897   | 0.3783   | 0.1365   | -0.0633  | 0.4193   | 0.2371     |
| Basket-products        | 0.07     | 0.4758   | -0.2549  | 0.4885   | -0.0435  | 0.5677   | 0.1409     |
| Bowl-products          | 0.6141   | 0.3196   | 0.2904   | 0.1181   | 0.1224   | -0.1941  | 0.3699     |
| Bag-products           | 0.8584   | -0.1361  | 0.0629   | -0.0436  | -0.0284  | 0.085    | 0.2307     |
| Paint bowl-products    | 0.8316   | -0.2869  | 0.1424   | 0.1521   | -0.0516  | 0.0461   | 0.178      |

Source: Data analysis, 2024

| Constrains to Utilization                             | VS (3) |      | S (2   | S (2) |        | M (1) |        | NC (0) |        | WAI | Rank             |
|---|--------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----|------------------|
|   | Female | Male | Female | Male  | Female | Male  | Female | Male   | weight | WAI | Naiik            |
| Inadequate<br>access to<br>credit and<br>finance      | 23     | 29   | 4      | 0     | 20     | 2     | 8      | 3      | 186    | 2.1 | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| Inadequate<br>market<br>regulations<br>and standards  | 15     | 27   | 5      | 2     | 29     | 2     | 6      | 3      | 171    | 1.9 | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| High<br>competition<br>Poor                           | 11     | 6    | 23     | 26    | 9      | 0     | 12     | 2      | 158    | 1.8 | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| transportation<br>& storage<br>facilities             | 9      | 6    | 17     | 23    | 16     | 4     | 13     | 1      | 145    | 1.6 | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Poor<br>storability of<br>cassava roots               | 10     | 26   | 5      | 3     | 18     | 1     | 22     | 4      | 143    | 1.6 | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Poor<br>storability of<br>cassava<br>products         | 7      | 7    | 6      | 2     | 23     | 21    | 19     | 4      | 102    | 1.4 | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Inadequate<br>marketing<br>skills and<br>training     | 5      | 4    | 14     | 5     | 26     | 25    | 9      | 0      | 116    | 1.3 | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Limited<br>market<br>demand<br>Inadequate             | 7      | 3    | 7      | 4     | 35     | 26    | 6      | 1      | 113    | 1.3 | $7^{\text{th}}$  |
| packaging<br>and labeling<br>Gender-based             | 12     | 7    | 11     | 0     | 19     | 8     | 13     | 19     | 106    | 1.2 | 9 <sup>th</sup>  |
| discrimination<br>and cultural<br>barriers<br>Lack of | 3      | 4    | 11     | 3     | 26     | 21    | 15     | 6      | 96     | 1.1 | 10 <sup>th</sup> |
| marketing<br>cooperatives<br>or<br>associations       | 5      | 4    | 12     | 2     | 14     | 21    | 24     | 7      | 90     | 1.0 | 11th             |
| Lack of<br>market<br>information                      | 6      | 2    | 2      | 4     | 21     | 22    | 26     | 6      | 79     | 0.9 | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
| Limited<br>access to<br>markets                       | 2      | 3    | 6      | 1     | 21     | 2     | 26     | 28     | 52     | 0.6 | 13 <sup>th</sup> |

**Note**: VS - Very Severe, S - Severe, M - Mild, NC – Not at all a Constraint; Figures in parentheses, at the headings are weights of scale; WAI = Weighted Average Index **Source**: Data analysis, 2024