ASSESSMENT OF MARKET PARTICIPATION AMONG ARABLE CROP FARMERS IN ILORIN EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BY

SAMSON MOSES OVIA

HND/23/AGT/FT/0138

BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SCIENCES, KWARA STATE POLYTECHNIC, ILORIN

IN PARTIAL FUFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF HIGHER NATIONAL DIPLOMA (HND) IN AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SCIENCES.

JULY, 2025.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the project "ASSESSMENT OF MARKET PARTICIPATION AMONG ARABLE CROP FARMERS IN ILORIN EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT" has been read and approved as meeting the requirements for the award of Higher National Diploma (HND) certificate in Agricultural Technology in the Department of Agricultural Technology, Institute of Applied Science, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin.

MR. OLADEJO. A.Q **(Project Supervisor).**	**DATE**
MR. ALAYA A. K. **(Head of Unit).**	**DATE**
MR. I. K. BANJOKO **(Head of Department).**	**DATE**
MR. MOHAMMED S. B. **(Project Coordinator).**	**DATE**
(External Examiner).	**DATE**

DEDICATION

This project work is dedicated to God Almighty, the Alpha and omega, the one who knows the end from the beginning and to my Gold. May you live long to reap the fruit of your labour in Jesus name

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give all glory to Almighty God for the strength, wisdom, and perseverance granted to me throughout the course of this research work.

My sincere gratitude goes to my ever supportive and humble supervisor MR OLADEJO .A.Q for his invaluable guidance, support, and constructive criticism which greatly contributed to the success of this project. His dedication and mentorship have been a source of inspiration to me.

I am deeply grateful to my father Mr Akinola whose steadfast support, encouragement, and prayers have been a constant source of strength throughout my academic journey. His belief in me has helped me push through challenges and stay focused on my goals.

I also wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to my guardian, Mrs. Anishere, for her continuous care, support, and guidance. Her role in my academic and personal development can never be forgotten. I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to all my coursemates and friends, whose encouragement, academic support, and companionship made the journey worthwhile. The shared experiences, group discussions, and moments of laughter helped ease the challenges of this academic pursuit. I am truly grateful for your presence and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the level and determinants of market participation among arable crop farmers in Ilorin East Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. Market participation is essential for transforming subsistence agriculture into a more commercial and income-generating enterprise. Despite the agricultural potential of the region, many smallholder farmers remain poorly integrated into markets, limiting their income and productivity. A multistage sampling technique was used to select 120 arable crop farmers, and data were collected through structured questionnaires. Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze socio-economic characteristics, while multiple regression analysis was used to identify the factors influencing market participation.

The results showed that market participation was generally low among respondents, with only a modest proportion of total farm output sold. The major constraints identified were high transportation cost, poor road infrastructure, inadequate storage facilities, and limited access to market information. Regression results revealed that transportation cost and social infrastructure had significant influence on the proportion of output marketed, while variables such as age, gender, household size, and farm size were not statistically significant.

The study concluded that infrastructural and logistical barriers play a major role in hindering effective market participation. It recommends targeted investment in rural infrastructure, improved storage facilities, and support for cooperative marketing systems to enhance the commercial integration of arable crop farmers in the study area.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Agriculture is the backbone of Nigeria's economy, providing employment and income for millions of people, particularly in rural areas (Olayemi, 2011). The sector accounts for about 25% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employs about 70% of the labor force (Adeoye, 2015). However, despite its importance, the agricultural sector in Nigeria faces numerous challenges, including limited access to markets, lack of market information, and poor market infrastructure (Okuneye, 2013).

Arable crop farming is a significant agricultural activity in Ilorin Local Government Area, with many farmers engaging in the production of crops such as maize, sorghum, and cowpeas (Kwara State Ministry of Agriculture, 2016). However, despite the importance of arable crop farming in the area, many farmers face challenges in accessing markets for their produce. This is partly due to the lack of market information, poor market infrastructure, and limited access to financial resources (Adebayo, 2015).

Market participation is critical for farmers to sell their produce, increase their income, and improve their livelihoods (Oyewole, 2011). However, limited access to markets, lack of market information, and poor market infrastructure can hinder farmers' ability to participate in markets (Adebayo, 2015). Several studies have examined market participation among small-scale farmers in Nigeria. For example, Adekunle (2017) found that market participation was positively correlated with income among small-scale farmers in Nigeria. Similarly, Ojo (2019) found that access to market information and financial resources were significant factors influencing market participation among small-scale farmers in Nigeria.

The concept of market participation is complex and multifaceted. It involves the ability of farmers to access markets, negotiate prices, and sell their produce (Adekunle, 2017). Market participation can be influenced by a range of factors, including access to market information, market infrastructure, and financial resources (Ojo, 2019).

Additionally, studies have shown that market participation can have a positive impact on farmers' income and livelihoods (Abubakar, 2019; Oyedele, 2018). However, market participation can also be influenced by external factors such as market fluctuations and government policies (Afolabi, 2020).

1.2. Problem statement

Despite the significant role of arable crop farming in Ilorin Local Government Area (LGA), smallholder farmers face major challenges in market participation. Poor infrastructure, including inadequate roads and storage facilities, increases transportation costs and leads to post-harvest losses, forcing farmers to sell at low prices (Adeoye et al., 2011). Limited access to credit further restricts investment in improved inputs and technologies, reducing

productivity and competitiveness (Omonona & Oni, 2011). Additionally, lack of market information weakens farmers' bargaining power, making them vulnerable to middlemen (Gebremedhin & Jaleta, 2011)

Despite government interventions, weak institutional frameworks and poor policy implementation have hindered effective market access for farmers (Afolami et al., 2011). This study seeks to assess the key factors affecting market participation among arable crop farmers in Ilorin LGA and recommend solutions for improving their market engagement and economic outcomes.

1.3. Research Question

The problem highlighted above gives rise to the following research questions

1. What are the social economic characteristics of the arable crop farmers in ilorin east local government area?
2. What is the level of market participation of farmers in the study area?
3. What are the factors influencing market participation in the study area?
4. What are the constraints of market participation facing farmers in the study area?

1.4. Objective of the study

1. To describe the social economic characteristics of arable crop farmers in the study area
2. To determine the level of market participation among arable crop farmers in the study area
3. To identify the factors influencing market participation among arable crop farmers in the study area
4. To examine the constraints faced by arable crop farmers in participating in the market

1.5. Hypothesis of the study

The hypothesis of the study is stated in null form.

There is no significant relationship between selected social economic and market participation among arable crop farmers in ilorin east government area.

1.6. Significance of the study

The finding of this study will provide valuable insights into the market participation of arable crop farmers in ilorin east local government area. It will also contribute to the existing literature on market participation among farmers in Nigeria.

1.7. Operational definition of terms

1. Market Participation – The extent to which arable crop farmers engage in selling their produce in formal or informal markets beyond subsistence consumption (Barrett, 2011).

2. Smallholder Farmers – Farmers who cultivate small plots of land, typically less than five hectares, and rely on family labor for production (Afolami, Obayelu, & Vaughan, 2011).

3. Arable Crops – Crops that are grown primarily for food and cash purposes, including maize, cassava, yam, and vegetables, which are commonly cultivated in Ilorin LGA (Adeoye, Yusuf, & Balogun, 2011).

4. Infrastructure – Physical facilities such as roads, storage facilities, and market stalls that facilitate the transportation, preservation, and sale of agricultural produce (Gebremedhin & Jaleta, 2011).

5. Market Information – Data on product prices, demand trends, buyer preferences, and trading conditions that influence farmers' selling decisions (Afolami et al., 2011).

6. Credit Access – The ability of farmers to obtain financial resources from banks, cooperatives, or microfinance institutions to invest in agricultural production and marketing (Barrett, 2011).

7. Middlemen (Intermediaries) – Traders who buy agricultural produce from farmers at lower prices and resell it in larger markets at higher prices, often controlling market access for smallholder farmers (Adeoye et al., 2011).

8. Commercial Agriculture – The practice of farming primarily for market sales rather than for household consumption, which requires significant investment in inputs, labor, and technology (Omonona & Oni, 2011).

9. Extension Services – Government or private-sector programs that provide farmers with training, technical advice, and market information to improve agricultural productivity and market participation (Gebremedhin & Jaleta, 2011).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Market participation

Market participation refers to the extent to which farmers engage in the sale of their agricultural produce in formal or informal markets, beyond subsistence consumption (Barrett, 2011). It involves the decision to sell, what proportion of the output to sell, and where and how to sell it. It is a critical pathway through which smallholder farmers can increase their incomes, access agricultural technologies, and become integrated into the wider economy (Agwu et al., 2012).

2.2. Arable crop production in Nigeria

The expected role of agriculture in Nigeria economy cannot be overemphasized. Arable crop farming is a type of crop production that produces a wide range of annual crops. Arable crop production is one of the agricultural subsectors that have thrived over the years in Nigeria (Akpan, Udoh and Aya, 2010). This can be attributed to various factors including low cost per unit of resources used in production, short gestation period and quick returns on invested capital compared to other sub sectors of agriculture (Udoh, 2005). The important arable crops in Nigeria includes: Cereals, Legumes, Root and Fiber.

2.2.2 Arable Crops

Arable crops are cultivated on ploughed land and include maize, cassava, yam, sorghum, and rice. These crops form the staple food base of Nigeria and are mainly cultivated by smallholder farmers using traditional methods (Afolami et al., 2015).

2.3. Theoretical Framework

The following economic theories provide a framework for analyzing market participation behavior among arable crop farmers:

2.3.1 Utility Maximization Theory

This theory posits that farmers make decisions—such as whether to sell in the market—to maximize utility based on available resources, preferences, and constraints (Key, Sadoulet & de Janvry, 2000). In this context, a farmer chooses to participate in markets if doing so increases household satisfaction or welfare.

2.3.2 Agricultural Household Model (AHM)

The AHM integrates production and consumption decisions. According to Olwande and Mathenge (2012), a farmer may choose not to participate in the market if the expected revenue does not outweigh the transaction costs or risks involved.

2.3.3 Transaction Cost Theory

This theory, as proposed by Williamson (1985), suggests that market participation is hindered by transaction costs such as poor infrastructure, lack of information, and price fluctuations. Farmers may opt out of markets due to high transportation costs, poor roads, and limited access to storage.

2.4 Empirical Review of Market Participation

Several studies have identified factors that influence market participation, including:

- Age and Experience: While older farmers may have more experience, younger farmers are often more innovative and open to market dynamics (Osmani & Hossain, 2015).
- Farm Size and Output: Larger farms tend to produce more surplus, increasing the likelihood of market participation (Amaza et al., 2014).
- Access to Credit: Farmers with financial access can invest in inputs and transportation, boosting surplus and market activity (Ayanwale & Adeola, 2012).
- Extension Services: Information from extension workers increases awareness and skills needed for profitable farming (Abay et al., 2017).
- Market Information and Infrastructure: These directly affect the profitability and risk of participating in markets (Ojo & Adebayo, 2012).

2.5 Low Productivity Among Arable Crop Farmers

Despite the agricultural potential of Nigeria, productivity among arable crop farmers remains low.

2.5.1 Meaning and Significance

Low productivity means that the quantity of output per unit of land or labor is below optimal levels. This limits marketable surplus and discourages commercial production.

2.5.2 Causes of Low Productivity

- Use of traditional tools and methods: Many smallholder farmers rely on hoes and cutlasses rather than mechanized equipment.
- Inadequate access to inputs: Improved seeds, fertilizers, and agrochemicals are often unavailable or unaffordable (Afolami et al., 2015).
- Lack of irrigation: Heavy reliance on rain-fed agriculture exposes production to climate variability (Oladipo & Abubakar, 2019).
- Pests and diseases: These cause substantial post-harvest losses, reducing the quantity and quality of produce.
- Limited credit and financial services: Without capital, farmers cannot invest in productivity-enhancing technologies (Agwu et al., 2012).

- Poor extension services: Many farmers lack access to up-to-date knowledge about improved practices (Mmbando et al., 2015).

2.5.3 Impact of Low Productivity

Low productivity leads to:

- Reduced marketable surplus
- Lower household income
- Limited ability to adopt innovation
- Food insecurity

This condition creates a cycle where farmers are unable to improve production, which limits their capacity to participate meaningfully in markets.

2.6 Constraints to Market Participation

A number of systemic and operational constraints affect farmers' ability to sell their output:

- High Transportation Cost: Increases the cost of accessing distant markets (Ayanwale & Adeola, 2012).
- Poor Road Infrastructure: Makes it difficult for farmers to move produce, especially during rainy seasons (Ojo & Adebayo, 2012).
- Inadequate Storage: Leads to post-harvest losses and pressure to sell immediately at low prices (Abay et al., 2017).
- Market Risk and Price Fluctuation: Creates uncertainty and discourages commercialization.
- Social Infrastructure Deficiencies: Lack of cooperatives, electricity, and ICT tools restricts efficiency (Oladipo & Abubakar, 2019).

2.7 Agricultural Context of Ilorin East LGA

Ilorin East LGA, Kwara State, is an agrarian community with fertile land suitable for arable crops. The area has potential for surplus production, but infrastructural deficits (poor roads, lack of cooperative societies, and weak market linkages) limit the ability of farmers to fully participate in output markets. Most farmers are smallholders who practice rain-fed, subsistence-oriented agriculture.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0. Research Methodology

3.1. Study Area

The study was conducted in ilorin east Kwara state Nigeria. Ilorin is the capital of Kwara state, Nigeria. Ilorin is made up of five local government area which are ilorin east local government, Asa local government area, Moro local government area, ilorin west local government area, ilorin south local government area.

Ilorin east local government area is one of the 16 local government area in kwara state, Nigeria. It is situated in the northern part of the state and has its headquarters in the town of OKE - OYI.

3.2. The population of the study

The population of the study comprised all the arable crop farmers in ilorin east local government Area.

3.3. The sampling procedure and sample size

The study employed a multi stage sampling procedure to select the respondents. The first stage involved a purposive selection of ilorin east local government. The second stage involved the random selection of 5 wards from the local government area. The third stage involved the random selection of 24 arable crop farmers from the selected wards making up at total of 120.

3.4. Method of Data Analysis

The method of data analysis included the use of descriptive statistics, Binary logistic regression (BLR) and Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC).

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Results and discussion

4.1 Socio economic characteristics of respondents

4.1.1 Distribution of respondents by gender

The table 4.1 below showed the distribution of respondents by sex. The table showed that 84.2% of the respondents are male while 15.8% of the respondents are

female. This indicates that majority of the arable farmers in the study area are male.

Table 4.1: frequency distribution of respondents by sex

Gender	frequency	percent
Male	101	84.2
Female	19	15.8
Total	120	100.0

4.1.2 Distribution of respondents by age

The table 4.2 below showed the distribution of respondents by their age. The table showed that 31.7% of the respondents fell between 31-40 years, 27.5% fell between 41-50 years, 9.2% fell between 51-60 years, 5% are above 60 year and 26.7% are 30 years and below

Table 4.2: frequency distribution of respondents by age

Age	Frequency	Percent
<30	32	26.7
31-40	38	31.7
41-50	33	27.5
51-60	11	9.2
Above 60	6	5.0
Total	120	100.0

4.1.3 Distribution of respondent by marital status

The table 4.3 below showed the distribution of respondents by their martial status. The table

showed that 85.5% of the respondents are married, while 17.5% of the respondents are unmarried. This implies majority of the respondents in the study area are married and have a sense of responsibility

Table 4.3: frequency distribution of respondents by marital status

Martial status	Frequency	Percent
Unmarried	101	17.5
married	19	82.5
Total	120	100.0

4.1.4 Distribution of respondents by Households size

The table 4.4 below showed the distribution of arables farmers by their household size. The table showed that 50.8% of the farming households has household size of less than 5 person while 32.5% has household size of 6-10 person and 16.7% and above. This implies that majority of the respondents has a fairly large household size.

Table 4.4: frequency distribution of respondents by household size

Household size	Frequency	Percent
<5	61	50.8
5-10	39	32.5
Above 10	20	16.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.5 Distribution of respondents by educational level

The table 4.5 below showed the distribution of respondents by their educational level. The table showed that 8.3% of the arable farmers had primary education, while 55% of the farmers had secondary education, while 15.8% of the farmers are no formal education while 20.8% of the farmers had tertiary education. This implies that the arable farmers are literate

Table 4.5: frequency distribution of respondents by educational level

Educational level	Frequency	Percent
No formal	19	15.8
Primary	10	8.3

Secondary	66	55.0
Tertiary	25	20.8
Total	120	100.0

4.1.6 Distribution of respondents by farming experience

The table 4.6 below showed the distribution of respondents by farming experience. The table revealed that 53.3%,31.7%,8.3% and 6.7% of the respondents had farming experience of 10 years and below, 10-20 years, 20-30 years, above 30 years respectively.

Table 4.6: frequency distribution of respondents by farming experience

Yrs of farming	Frequency	Percent
<10 years	64	53.3
10-20 years	38	31.7
20-30 years	10	8.3
Above 30 years	8	6.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.7 Distribution of respondents by farm size in acres

The table 4:7 showed the distribution of respondents by farm size. The table revealed that 72.5%, 0.8% and 26.7% of the respondents had farm size on acres of less than 5 acres, 11-15 hectares and 6-10 acres.

Table 4.7: frequency distribution of respondents by farm size

Farm size	Frequency	Percent
<5 acres	87	72.5
11-15 hectares	1	0.8
6-10 acres	32	26.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.8 Distribution of respondents by farm total output in kg

The table 4.8 below showed the distribution of respondents by total output. The table

revealed that 12.5%,9.2%,10%,1.7% and 66.7% of the farmers total output were below 50kg, between 101-500kg, 500-1000kg, 51-100kg and above 1000kg respectively.

Table 4.8: frequency distribution of respondents total output

Total output	Frequency	Percent
< 50kg	15	12.5
101-500kg	11	9.2
500-1000kg	12	10.0
51-100kg	2	1.7
Above 1000kg	80	66.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.9 Distribution of respondents by crop type

The table 4.9 below showed the distribution of respondents by crop types. The table revealed that 63.3% of the crop type are cereal, while 15% of the crop type are legumes and 21.7% are root and tuber. This implies that majority of the respondents in the study are are into cereal.

Table 4.9: frequency distribution of respondents by crop types

Crop type	Frequency	Percent
Cereal	76	63.3
Legumes	18	15.0
Root and tubers	26	21.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.10 Distribution of respondents by membership in farmers Association

The table 4.10 below showed the distribution of respondents by membership in farmers association. The table showed that 53.3% of the respondents are in farmers association, while 45.0% of the respondents were non-member.

Table 4.10: frequency distribution of respondents by membership

Membership	Frequency	Percent
No	54	45.0

Yes	64	53.3
2	2	1.7
Total	120	100.0

4.1.11 Access to extension service

This study show that 34.2% of the respondents have access to extension services, while 65.8% have no access.

Table 4.11

Extension service	Frequency	Percent
No	79	65.8
Yea	41	34.2
Total	120	100.0

4.2 **Level of market participation**

4.2.1.Distribution of respondents by level of market participation

The table 4.2.1 below showed the distribution of respondents by total output brought to market. The table revealed that 1.7%,14.2%,35.8%,46.7% and 1.7% of the farmers total output brought to market were below 20-40%, between 40-60% and Above 80% respectively

Table 4.2.1: frequency distribution of respondents by total output brought to market

output brought	Frequency	Percent
20-40%	2	1.7
40-60%	17	14.2
60-80%	43	35.8
Above 80%	56	46.7
Less than 20	2	1.7
Total	120	100.0

4.2.2. Mode of sale

The study shows that most sales occur directly with consumers in 78.3% while reducing

reliance on middle-man.

Table 4.2.2

Mode of sale	Frequency	Percent
Directly to consumer	94	78.3
Through middleman	26	21.6
Total	120	100.0

4.2.3.Form sold

The study shows that majority of the farmers sell raw product by 92.2% while only 5.8% engage in processing.

Table 4.2.3

Form sold	Frequency	Percent
Raw	113	94.2
Processed	7	5.8
Total	120	100.0

4.2.4 Primary market

This study shows that 59.2% use local market while 18.3% sell to wholesale and 17.5% use urban market while 4.2% sell at farm gates and 0.8% to cooperatives.

Table 4.2.4

Primary market	Frequency	Percent
Farm gate	5	4.2
Local market	71	59.2
Urban market	21	17.5
cooperative	1	0.8
Wholesale	22	18.3
Total	120	100.0

4.3 Factors Influencing Market Participation

The result of market participation in table 3 shows that transportation cost and social infrastructure were significantly related to the extent of use of factors influencing among arable crop farmers. Transportation cost of the farmers significantly affect market participation at 5%.

Also, social infrastructure had positive influence on market participation. This implies that the Improving social infrastructure (better roads, storage, electricity, cooperatives, etc.) will increase the proportion of output farmers take to the market. The coefficient of social infrastructure was negative and significant, indicating that poor social infrastructure significantly reduces market participation among arable crop farmers.

Coefficients[a]	**Unstandardized Coefficients B**	**Std. Error**	**Standardized Coefficients Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	73.353	11.324		6.477	0.000
Age	0.094	0.252	0.057	0.375	0.708
Gender	-5.379	4.333	-0.121	-1.241	0.217
Household Size	0.161	0.470	0.037	0.343	0.732
Years of Farming Experience	-0.145	0.259	-0.086	-0.560	0.577
Farm Size	-0.652	0.800	-0.106	-0.815	0.417
Total Output	0.001	0.001	0.109	0.838	0.404
Market Access	-1.408	4.070	-0.041	-0.346	0.730
Market Information	0.270	4.384	0.008	0.062	0.951
Transportation Cost	9.619	4.820	0.207	1.996	0.048**
Social Infrastructure	-8.043	3.360	-0.243	-2.394	0.018**
a. Dependent Variable: Proportion of Total Output Taken to the Market					

4.4 Perceived Constraint faced by arable crop farmers with regards market participation.

The table 4.4 below shows the distribution of respondents based on the several of various constraints faced by arable farmers. The results are categorized into not severe, moderately severe, and severe, with corresponding mean scores used to rank their intensity.

Poor road network was reported as very severe factor by 51.5% of respondents, with a mean score of 1.52, High cost transportation was considered very severe by 63.3% and moderately

severe by 35.8%, with a mean score of 1.63, This significantly reduces farmers' incentives to participate in the market, as it cuts into their profit margins. Inadequate storage facilities had 45.8% reporting it as moderately severe and a mean of 1.18, showing that it reduces their ability to time the market and earn better returns. Inadequate market access was reported as not severe by 47.5%, with a mean of 0.72.Environmental factors was reported as moderately severe by 58.3% with a means of 1.17, indicating it is a consistent threat to productivity and planning.

Overall, the table indicates that poor road network, high transportation cost, are the most severe constraint faced by Arable crop farmers in the study area.

Perceived Constraint	Not Severe	Moderately Severe	Very Severe	Mean	Rank
Poor road Network	7 (5.8)	44 (36.7)	69 (57.5)	1.52	2
High Transportation Cost	1 (0.8)	43 (35.8)	76 (63.3)	1.63	1
Inadequate Storage facilities	22 (18.3)	55 (45.8)	43 (35.8)	1.18	4
Inadequate Market Access	57 (47.5)	40 (33.3)	23 (19.2)	0.72	7
Education	41 (34.2)	47 (39.2)	32 (26.7)	0.93	6
Environmental factors	15 (12.5)	70 (58.3)	35 (29.2)	1.17	5
Risk and Uncertainty	13 (10.8)	70 (58.3)	37 (30.8)	1.2	3

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5. 1 Summary

The main objective of the study was to determine the level of market participation among arable crop farmers in some selected communities in ilorin east local government areas of kwara state, Nigeria. The population of the study comprised all the arable crop farmer in the study. Data for the study were obtained from the respondents through interview by the use descriptive statistics and ordinary least square regression questionnaires for a Sample Size of 120 respondents.

Based on the data analyzed for this study, 84.2% of the respondents were male while the remaining 15.8% were female arable farmers. The marital status distribution revealed that there were more married sampled respondents with about 82.5% while 17.5% were unmarried respectively. The household size of the respondents shows that 32.5% has household size of 5-10 person and 16.7% has household size of above 10. The educational level revealed that 20.8% of the respondents had tertiary education, 8.3% had primary education, 55% had secondary education, and 15.8% had no formal education.

The distribution of respondent by their contact with extension agent shows that 34.2% of the arable farmers had contact with extension agent, while 65.8% of the arable farmers had no contact with extension agent.12.5%, 9.2%, 10%, 1.7%, 66.7% of the farmers total output were below 100kg, between 101-500kg, 500-1000kg and above 100kg respectively.

Data analyzed the years of farming experience of 10years and above, 31.7% had farming experience of 10-20 years and 8.3% had farming experience of 20-30 years. The size of the farm shows that 0.8% of the farmers have more than 10acres, 26.7% of the the farmers have between 6-10 acres and 72.5% of the farmers have below 5acres.

5.2 CONCLUSION

From the finding of the study, it may be concluded that arable farmers in the study lack extension agent on several management. About 53.3% of the respondents had up to 10yrs experience as nearly 83% of farmers bring more than 60% of their total output to the market. The dominant crops cultivated are cereals.

The marketing channels used are primarily local markets and direct-to-consumer sales, with minimal use of cooperatives or farm gate sales. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of farmers sell their produce in raw form, indicating limited involvement in value addition activities such as processing.

In conclusion, while market participation among arable crop farmers in llorin East LGA is generally high, several structural and institutional constraints-such as limited access to extension services, poor value addition, and weak cooperative systems-still hinder their

potential for income maximization and improved livelihoods. Addressing these issues through targeted policies and interventions could significantly enhance the market performance and economic resilience of these farmers.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings from the study on market participation among arable crop farmers in ilorin east local government area. It recommends:

1. Train farmers on processing techniques and provide small-scale equipment to increase income.

2. Invest in rural infrastructure and link farmers to larger urban and industrial markets.

3. Provide regular training and support to farmers on modern practices and market information.

4. Encourage young people to take up agriculture through training and start-up support.

Implementing these recommendations will not only improve the market participation of arable crop farmers but also contribute significantly to food security, poverty reduction, and rural development in Kwara State and beyond.

REFERENCE

Abay, K. A., Berhane, G., Taffesse, A. S., & Tirivayi, N. (2017). Understanding the heterogeneous impact of market participation on household welfare in rural Ethiopia. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01675.

Abubakar, A. A. (2019). Market Participation and Income of Small-Scale Farmers in North-Western Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 50(2), 151-164.

Adebayo, A. A. (2015). Factors Influencing Market Participation among Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 16(1), 1-12.

Adekunle, A. A. (2017). Market Participation and Technical Efficiency of Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural and Food Economics, 6(1), 1-12.

Adeoye, I. B. (2015). Assessment of Market Participation among Small-Scale Farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension, 19(1), 1-15.

Adeoye, I. B., Yusuf, S. A., & Balogun, O. S. (2011). Market structure and price integration of tomato in selected rural and urban markets in Oyo State, Nigeria. International Journal of Agricultural Economics & Rural Development, 4(2), 90-102.

Afolabi, A. A. (2020). Market Participation and Livelihoods of Small-Scale Farmers in South-Western Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural and Food Economics, 8(1), 1-12.

Afolami, C. A., Obayelu, A. E., & Vaughan, I. I. (2011). Welfare impact of market participation of smallholder farmers in Nigeria. World Development, 40(3), 758-769.

Afolami, C. A., Obayelu, A. E., & Vaughan, I. I. (2015). Welfare impact of adoption of improved cassava varieties by rural households in South Western Nigeria. Agricultural and Food Economics, 3(1), 1–17.

Agwu, N. M., Anyanwu, C. I., & Mendie, E. I. (2012). Socio-economic determinants of commercialization among smallholder farmers in Abia State, Nigeria. Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 2(8), 392–397.

Amaza, P. S., Umeh, J. C., Helsen, J., & Adejobi, A. O. (2014). Determinants of market participation among smallholder farmers in Nigeria. Production Agriculture and Technology Journal, 10(2), 49–58.

Ayanwale, A. B., & Adeola, S. S. (2012). Determinants of market participation in Nigerian sesame production: A probit regression approach. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 7(44), 5939–5945.

Kwara State Ministry of Agriculture. (2016). Kwara State Agricultural Development Plan. Kwara State Government.

Barrett, C. B. (2011). Smallholder market participation: Concepts and evidence from eastern

and southern Africa. Food Policy, 36(2), 299-317.

Barrett, C. B. (2011). Market participation: Concepts and evidence from Eastern and Southern Africa. Food Policy, 36(2), 299–317.

Gebremedhin, B., & Jaleta, M. (2011). Market orientation and market participation of smallholders in Ethiopia: Implications for commercial transformation. Journal of International Development, 24(7), 1121-1134.

Key, N., Sadoulet, E., & de Janvry, A. (2000). Transactions costs and agricultural household supply response. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 82(2), 245–259.

Mmbando, F. E., Wale, E. Z., & Baiyegunhi, L. J. (2015). Welfare impacts of market participation and the transaction costs of maize marketing in Tanzania. Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics, 7(3), 99–111.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2020). Nigerian Gross Domestic Product Report Q4 2020. Abuja, Nigeria.

Ojo, M. A., & Adebayo, E. F. (2012). Analysis of market participation among smallholder rice farmers in North Central Nigeria. Production Agriculture and Technology Journal, 8(2), 98–106.

Oladipo, A. A., & Abubakar, M. (2019). Constraints to arable crop productivity in Kwara State, Nigeria. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 14(5), 270–278.

Olwande, J., & Mathenge, M. (2012). Market participation among poor rural households in Kenya. Tegemeo Institute Working Paper 146.

Osmani, A. G., & Hossain, E. (2015). Market participation decision of smallholder farmers and its determinants in Bangladesh. Economics of Agriculture, 62(1), 163–179.

Ojo, S. O. (2019). Factors Influencing Market Participation among Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural and Food Economics, 8(1), 1-12.

Olayemi, J. K. (2011). Market Participation and Technical Efficiency of Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 12(1), 1-12.

Omonona, B. T., & Oni, O. A. (2011). Determinants of market participation by maize farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. Journal of Economics and Rural Development, 16(1), 45-58.

Okuneye, P. A. (2013). Market Structure and Price Determination in the Nigerian Agricultural Sector. Journal of Economic and Financial Studies, 4(1), 1-12.

Oyewole, S. O. (2011). Market Participation and Income of Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 12(2), 151-164.

Oyedele, O. A. (2018). Market Participation and Income of Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 49(2), 151-164.