

E-ISSN: 2346-7290

## **An analysis of market associations' activities in the marketing of rice and beans in Enugu State, Nigeria**

<sup>1</sup>Alufohai, G. O., <sup>1</sup>Olisakwe, I. O. and <sup>2</sup>Ekunwe, P.A.\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Benin, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Corresponding author (Email: peter.ekunwe@uniport.edu.ng)

### **ABSTRACT**

This study examined market associations' activities in the marketing of rice and beans in Enugu State, Nigeria. Specific objectives described the socio-economic characteristics of rice and beans marketers, identified activities of the different market associations and determined effects of market associations' activities on profit margin and marketing margin and identified the constraints faced by the marketers. Purposive and simple random sampling methods were used to select 200 respondents from two main markets: Ogbete and Ogige Market. Only 152 copies of the questionnaire out of the 200 administered were found relevant for the analysis. Eighty-eight of the respondents were members of market associations while 64 were not. The data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics, gini coefficient and regression analysis. The results of the analysis showed that majority of the respondents were male. Mean age was 39 years for members and 41 years for non-members; about 83% of the respondents were literates and have been in the business for more than 10 years. A Gini coefficient of 0.752 for rice and 0.776 for beans was obtained in the study showing a high market concentration. The regression analysis for profit margin showed an  $R^2$  of 0.763 for beans marketing an  $R^2$  of 0.747 for rice marketing. The  $R^2$  indicated that 76.3% and 74.7% of the variation in profit margin for beans and rice marketing respectively were accounted for by the explanatory variables in their respective model. The results of the regression analysis on size of the marketing margin showed that the explanatory variables accounted for 68.3% of the change in the size of the marketing margin and 68.7% in the case of beans marketing. Constraints faced by the marketers were poor transportation link, poor communication, and price fluctuations.

**Key words:** Rice and Beans marketing, Gini coefficient, Market Association, Enugu State

### **INTRODUCTION**

Agricultural marketing covers the services involved in moving of agricultural products from the farmer to the consumer Kohls and Uhl (1990). The marketing system is able to achieve this role by the provision of certain basic marketing services. Nwaizugbo (2004), in asserting the important services

and functions the marketing system provides, pointed out that marketing is concerned with all systems of operation which aid the movement of commodities from the producers to the consumers. This is said to include buying, selling, advertising, assembling, storage, transportation, processing, grading and standardization, and

financing of all these activities and above all, bringing buyers and sellers together. An efficient marketing system according to him will find where there are surpluses of produce and bring them to where there are shortages. Olukosi, Isitor and Ode (2007), included risk bearing and provision of marketing information among the functions performed in the marketing system.

The marketing system provides these services through the network of market intermediaries and middlemen. Movement of staple food crops such as rice and beans from areas of surplus production and concentration to areas of consumption and/or deficit (urban users) create the need for distribution as performed by middlemen (Agbebi and Fagbote, 2012). Availability of rice and beans to the consumer at the right time and place requires an effective marketing system. At the same time importance of rice and beans marketing is to ensure the flow of these produces from the farmers to consumers in the form, time and place that will be convenient. This involves some other players along the rice and the beans distribution channel especially market associations (Lawal and Idega, 2004).

Uduji, Oyaka and Edicha, (2012) also emphasized that there is enough domestic production of food in Nigeria but the problem lies mainly on marketing and institutional distribution arrangements, which greatly reduce available market supply where it is needed. These institutions include individuals and market associations. The motive behind the formation of such market associations is another controversial aspect of market organization. People believe that there are ulterior motives behind the formation of such associations. Evidence exists where these associations actually influence price mechanism in the markets by interfering with the forces of demand and supply (Onyeabor, 2009). In urban markets,

marketing associations exist among foodstuff sellers. The market associations also play the economic role of providing form, place, and time utilities which in turn could help in stabilizing the prices of agricultural products (Agbebi and Fagbote, 2012).

Unfortunately, much attention has not been paid to the marketing sector, which plays as much important role in any economy as the actual production of goods and services. Olukosi *et al.* (2007), buttressed this with a note that marketing has had less attention than production and that, for economic development, it is important to increase farm output, as well as the marketing system so that the extra production reaches the consumer efficiently. Eze, Onwubuya and Ezeh, (2010) observed that despite the invaluable services provided by these market associations, they have been greatly criticized by both consumers and producers and have been branded as exploiters. People believe that the services of these market associations are unnecessary and that their elimination from the marketing system will be most desirable which might imply the lack of understanding of the role of intermediary, for this reason ‘middlemen’ has become very much a pejorative word. Since several studies have discussed this view extensively, the following questions therefore become pertinent. Are the market associations really exploitative? What are the activities of the associations? Do their activities affect the marketing of rice and beans? Do these associations affect the market concentration of the stated commodities? To investigate these claims, it became important to assess the role of market associations in the marketing of rice and beans using Enugu State, Nigeria as a case study. Specifically, the objectives were to: describe the socio-economic characteristics of rice and beans marketers in

Enugu State; identify the different market associations involved in the marketing of rice and beans and their activities in the study area; determine the effect of the activities of the associations on profit and size of the marketing margin; examine the effect of their activities on selling price differentials; assess the market concentration for rice and beans marketing; identify the constraints faced in the marketing of rice and beans in the study area.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study was carried out in Enugu State which is located on the Eastern part of Nigeria. The State has a land area of about 8022.95 km<sup>2</sup> and a projected population of 3,796,684 as at 2011 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2012). It lies between Latitudes 5° 56" North to 7° 06" North and Longitudes 6° 53" East to 7° 55" East (Ezike, 1998). It is bound by seven other States: Ebonyi on the North East, in the South by Abia and Imo, in the North by Benue and Kogi and in the East and South West by Cross River and Anambra States respectively (Ezike, 1998). The State experiences two climatic seasons, the wet and dry seasons. The wet or rainy season lasts from April to October and dry season begins in November and ends in March. Enugu State is endowed with abundant fertile land. Agriculture is the major occupation of the people while a large percentage of the populace are involved in agricultural produce marketing. According to Enugu State Agricultural Development Project (2009), the State has two major urban markets namely: Ogige Main market in Nsukka and Ogbete New market in Enugu. The State also has other rural markets which operate once in four days like Orie Orba, Orie Ohodo, Afor Opi, Eke Obollo, Orie Igboeze, Eke Ede-Oballa, Nkwo Ibagwa markets amongst others. They all specialize in foodstuff marketing. The main market is a general purpose market in which a wide range of imported goods and

local produce are obtained alongside the foodstuff.

## **Sampling Procedures and Data Collection**

Two-stage sampling was used in selecting the respondents. The first stage was a purposive sampling of the two main urban markets in the Enugu State (Ogbete new market at Enugu and Ogige main market at Nsukka). The second stage was the simple random sampling of 100 rice and beans marketers out of the 126 registered members in Ogbete new market, Enugu and 100 rice and beans marketers in Ogige main market, Nsukka. Primary data were obtained using structured questionnaire alongside interview scheduled.

Out of 200 marketers interviewed, only 152 (76%) provided relevant information for analysis, 88 marketers in Ogbete main market Enugu, and 64 marketers in Ogige main market, Nsukka. In Ogbete main market, Enugu, all the marketers were members of the market association because the association is very strong and non-members were not allowed to sell in the market but in Ogige main market, associations for rice and beans marketers were no longer in existence. There were different methods of measuring or weighing rice and beans in these markets. A bag of rice weighs about 50 kg which contains about 18 'mudus', a bag of beans weighs about 115 kg which contains about 40 'mudu'. A 'mudu' is about 2.8 kg which contains about 12 'cigarette' cups; this implies that about four 'cigarette' cups is equal to 1 kg.

## **Data Analysis Technique**

The following data analytical techniques were used to analyze the data collected. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages and means were used to

describe the socio-economic characteristics of the marketers, the activities of the market associations, and the major constraints associated with rice and beans marketing.

Gini Coefficient (G.C) was used to determine the market concentration for rice and beans marketers in the study area.

$$\text{Gini Coefficient} = 1 - \sum YX \text{ -----} \quad (1)$$

Where Y = Percentage of sellers

X = Percentage of total sales.

Three functional forms (linear, semi-log and double-log) were employed, out of which the lead equation (Linear) was chosen to determine the effect of market associations' activities on profit margin. The explicit form of the linear function used was:

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + U \quad (2)$$

Where

Y = Profit Margin

X<sub>1</sub> = Membership of market associations

(Dummy variable: members =1, non – members =0)

X<sub>2</sub> = Transportation cost (₦)

X<sub>3</sub> = Storage cost (₦)

X<sub>4</sub> = Market charges (₦)

X<sub>5</sub> = Selling price (₦)

a = Intercept

β = coefficients

U = error term

Also, the marketing margin analysis was used to capture the effect of the activities of the market associations on the size of the marketing margin.

The explicit form of the linear function used was:

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + U \text{ -----} \quad (3)$$

Where

Y = Size of the marketing margin

X<sub>1</sub> = Membership of market associations

(Dummy variable: members =1, non – members =0)

X<sub>2</sub> = Transportation cost (₦)

X<sub>3</sub> = Storage cost (₦)

X<sub>4</sub> = Market charges (₦)

X<sub>5</sub> = Mark-up (₦)

a = Intercept

β = coefficients

U = error term

Using the discriminant approach, a regression analysis of price differentials was also used to determine the effect of activities of the market associations on the difference in the selling price for members and non-members of associations. The explicit form of the function used was

$$\Delta Y = b_0 + b_1 \Delta Tc + b_2 \Delta Sc + b_3 \Delta Mk + b_4 \Delta Cp + U \text{ -----} \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta Y = f(\Delta Tc, \Delta Sc, \Delta Mk, \Delta Cp) + U \text{ -----} \quad (5)$$

Where ΔY = Change in Selling Price

$\Delta T_c$  = Change in Transport Cost

$\Delta M_k$  = Change in Markup price

$\Delta C_p$  = Change in Cost Price

$\Delta$  = the marginal rate or additional cost or price.

## RESULTS

### Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

The socio-economic characteristics of rice and beans marketers in the study area are presented in Table showed that out of 88 members of the market association in Ogbete new market Enugu, 72 (81.8%) were males, while 16 (18.2%) were females. The scenario was the same among rice and beans marketers in Ogige main market, Nsukka. Out of 64 marketers who were non-members of the market association, 51(79.79%) were males as against 13 (20.3%) females. The result indicates that only non-members had respondents above 60 years of age while the marketers below 60 years were 29 (33.0%) and 21 (32.8%) within the age bracket of 41-50 years for members and non-members respectively. Majority of the marketers (above 70%) were between 31 and 50 years of age. The marital status of the respondents in the study showed that 66 (75.0%) members and 51 (79.7%) non-members were married, 12 (13.6%) members and nine (14.1%) non-members were single This shows that majority (above 70%) of the rice and beans marketers in the study area were married. The result in Table 1 showed that members and non-members with household size below three persons were 14 (15.9%) and 10 (15.6 %) respectively. Household size between three to five persons accounted for 28 (31.8%) and 17 (26.6%) for members and non-members respectively. Household size between six to eight persons were 35 (39.8%) and 23 (35.9%). Table 1 further showed that only 15 (17.0%) members and 12 (18.8%) non-members had no formal education, 36 (40.9%) and 29 (45.3%) had

primary education, 29 (33.0%) and 18 (28.1%) had secondary education. Result for the study showed that eight (9.1%) members and seven (10.9%) non-members had one to five years of marketing experience, nine (10.2%) and six (9.4%) had between six to ten years of experience, 24 (27.3%) and 21 (32.8%) had between eleven to fifteen years of experience, 23 (26.1%) and 14 (21.9%) had between sixteen and twenty years of marketing experience, 20 (22.7%) and 13 (20.3%) had twenty-one to twenty-six years of experience, while only four(4.6%) members and three (4.7%) non-members had above twenty-six years of marketing experience.

### Activities of the Market Associations

Table.2 showed that marketers performed functions like arranged bulk purchase (100%), arranged group transportation (100%), supply of market information (100%) , settlement of disputes among members (100%), safeguard market stalls (33%), sanitation of the market (33%) while enforcement of grades of commodities sold by members and provision of credit were not identified by any of the respondents.

### Profit Margin Analysis

The result of the profit margin analysis is presented in Table 3.

The results show that the coefficient of determination  $R^2$  was 0.763 for beans and 0.747 for rice implying that the explanatory variables accounted for 76.3% and 74.7% of the change in profit margin for beans and rice respectively. For beans Marketers, the coefficients for transport cost, storage cost and market charges were negative and

significant at 1% level while membership status and selling price ( $X_5$ ) were positive and significant at 1% level. The F- value of 83.61 for beans and 38.24 for rice were significant at 1%. The result of the margin analysis is presented in Table 4.

### Price differentials

The results off the determinant of price differential is presented in Table 5. The results showed that all the variables were significant at 1% level. Rice had an R-square of 60.9% while beans had an R-square of 92.6%.

### Gini coefficient

The results of the Gini coefficient for rice and beans is presented inn Tables 6 and7. The results showed a Gini coefficient of 0.752 for rice marketers and 0.776 for beans marketers.

### Constraints

The result of the constraints faced by the marketers is presented in Table 8. The result showed that 99% each of members of market associations identified poor transportation and price fluctuation as constraints while 100% and 98% of non-members identified poor transportation and poor communication as constraints faced by them.

**Table 1:** Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Beans and Rice Marketers

		Membership status			
		Member		Non-member	
		Frequency (n=88)	%	Frequency (n=64)	%
Sex	Female	16	18.2	13	20.3
	Male	72	81.8	51	79.7
marital status	Single	12	13.6	9	14.1
	Married	66	75.0	51	79.7
	widow(er)	10	11.4	4	6.3
Age	30 & below	10	11.4	5	7.8
	31-40	42	47.7	31	48.4
	41-50	29	33.0	21	32.8
	51-60	7	8.0	5	7.8
	>60			2	3.1
Household size	<3	14	15.9	10	15.6
	3-5	28	31.8	17	26.6
	6-8	35	39.8	23	35.9
	>8	11	12.5	14	21.9
Education	no formal education	15	17.0	12	18.8
	Primary	36	40.9	29	45.3
	Secondary	29	33.0	18	28.1
	Tertiary	3	3.4	2	3.1
	adult education	5	5.7	3	4.7

	1 – 5	8	9.1	7	10.9
	6 – 10	9	10.3	6	9.4
Marketing experience	11 – 15	24	27.3	21	32.8
	16 – 20	23	26.1	14	21.9
	21 – 25	20	22.7	13	20.3
	≥ 26	4	4.6	3	4.7

Source: Field Data 2013

**Table 2:** Activities of Market Associations

	Those engaged		Those that do not engage	
	*Freq	%	*Freq	%
Supply of market information to members	88	100.0	Nil	Nil
Settlement of dispute among members	88	100.0	Nil	Nil
Arranging bulk buying	88	100.0	Nil	Nil
Arranging group storage	88	100.0	Nil	Nil
Arranging group transport	88	100.0	Nil	Nil
Safeguarding of markets stalls	29	33.0	59	67.0
sanitation of the market	29	33.0	59	67.0
Provision of credit	Nil	Nil	88	100.0
Enforcement of grades of commodities sold by members	Nil	Nil	88	100.0

Source: Field Data 2013

\*Multiple response

**Table 3:** Profit Margin Analysis of beans and rice marketers (Multiple regressions)

Variables	Beans		Rice	
	B	t	b	t
Constant	10,273.839***	21.670	7944.788***	27.784
Membership status	186.479***	11.615	217.886***	9.808
Market charges	-2.228***	7.158	0.800**	2.132
Cost of transport	-0.592***	4.034	-3.953***	7.066
Storage cost	-0.544***	3.714	-0.500	1.781
Selling price	1.157***	24.623	1.128***	30.711
<b>Model statistics</b>				
F value	83.611		38.236***	
R square	0.763		0.747	
SE	3.065		6.8761	

Source: Field Data 2013

\*\*\*= P &lt; 0.01 and \*\*= P &lt; 0.05

**Table 4:** Marketing Margin Analysis of beans and rice marketing (Multiple regression)

Variables	Beans		Rice	
	B	T	B	t
Constant	6.335***	3.15017	5.462***	5.924
Membership status	2.331**	2.42056	0.203	0.021
Market charges	0.213	0.79478	0.402	1.139
Cost of transport	0.299**	2.8476	0.341**	2.385
Storage cost	0.442	1.4539	0.233**	2.044
Mark- up	0.607**	2.68465	0.478**	2.143
<b>Model statistics</b>				
F value	28.945		62.136***	
R square	0.687		0.683	
SE	0.0037		0.019	

Source: Field Data 2013

\*\*\*= P < 0.01 and \*\*= P < 0.05

**Table 5:** Determinants of Price differentials (Regression Results)

Independent variables	Rice		Beans	
	B	t	B	t
Constant	2.281	4.711	4.359	64.224
Transport cost	0.017***	7.332	0.005***	16.990
Storage cost	0.002***	8.675	0.001***	20.055
Cost Price	0.011***	4.885	0.004***	15.622
Mark up	0.016***	11.816	0.005***	27.359
<b>Model statistics</b>				
F value	37.47		199.44***	
R <sup>2</sup>	0.698		0.926	
SE	1.012		0.122	

Source: Field Data 2013

\*\*\*= P < 0.01



**Table 6:** Estimate of Gini Coefficient for rice marketers

Range of Total sales (₦)	No. of sellers	Proportion of sellers (Y)	Total value of sales (₦)	proportion of total sales	Cumulative proportion of total sales (X)	YX
25000 & below	16	0.105	19,225.00	0.092	0.092	0.010
25,001-50,000	79	0.520	43,560.76	0.208	0.300	0.108
50,001-75,000	30	0.197	60,270.00	0.288	0.588	0.057
75,001-100,000	27	0.178	86,466.67	0.413	1.001	0.073
Total	152		209,522.43			
Gini Coefficient = $1 - \sum YX$						
						$\sum YX = 0.248$

Source: Field Data 2013

Gini coefficient =  $1 - 0.248 = 0.752$ **Table 7:** Estimate of Gini Coefficient for beans marketers

	No. of sellers	Proportion of sellers (Y)	Total value of sales (N)	Proportion of total sales (X)	Cumulative proportion of total sales	YX
25000 & below	17	0.112	20235.294	0.097	0.097	0.011
25,001-50,000	91	0.599	41708.791	0.199	0.296	0.119
50,001-75,000	35	0.230	64465.714	0.308	0.604	0.071
75,001-100,000	9	0.059	80000	0.382	0.986	0.023
Total	152		206,409.80			
Gini Coefficient = $1 - \sum YX$						
						$\sum YX = 0.224$

Source: Field Data 2013

Gini coefficient =  $1 - 0.224 = 0.776$ **Table 8:** Marketing Constraints faced by the marketers

	Member		Non-member	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Poor transportation Link	87	99.0	64	100.0
Price fluctuations	87	99.0	42	65.6
Poor communication	59	67.0	63	98.0
Insufficient capital	30	34.1	43	67.2
lack of storage facilities	29	33.0	43	67.2

Source: Field Data 2013

## **DISCUSSION**

There seems to be male dominance in the marketing of rice and beans in Enugu State as presented in Table 1 which suggests that men are observed to be more involved in rice and beans marketing. This may be due to the large capital outlay needed and the long distance involved in conveying these foodstuffs. This result agrees with the findings of Nwankwo (2000) who reported that rice and beans marketing is still within the domain of men while women are more involved in the marketing of other foodstuffs. The mean age was 39 years and 41 years for members and non-members respectively. This implies that those still in their active working age groups were into rice and beans marketing in the study area. This findings corroborates that of Agbebi and Fagbote (2012). Marketers of rice and beans in the study area had an average of seven persons per household. This shows that the marketers had large, medium and small household sizes in Enugu State. The outcome of the educational level indicates that some of the marketers in the study area were literate and this level of education will have implication on gathering information on marketing activities and marketing margin of the marketers. The average experience was found to be 16 years for members and 14 years for non-members and this shows that the rice and beans marketers were quite experienced in the business.

The result of the marketing performance activities is in agreement with the work of Agbebi and Fagbote (2012) who reported maintaining contact with buyers, negotiating prices, delivery transfer of title, servicing of products services, providing inventory and storage and arranging transportation as the different roles middlemen play in the marketing of Fish in Igbokoda Fish Market

in Ondo State, Nigeria. The result of the for profit margin in Table 3 means that increase in the transportation cost, storage cost and market charges will bring about a decrease in the profit margin (Y). The coefficient for selling price is positive and significant because profit margin also increases due to increase in selling price. The coefficient of membership status is positive and significant at 1% which implies that members of the market association has a higher profit margin as a result of their high mark-up. The scenario for rice marketers is similar except for the coefficient of market charges that is positive and significant. The values and significant of the F ratio indicate that the model can used for further analysis The result of the regression analysis for market margin shows that the explanatory variables; membership status, transport cost and mark-up were significant at 5% while market charges and storage cost were not. This means that a lower transportation cost and storage cost will lead to a reduction in the size of the marketing margin. Also, being a member of the market association increases the size of the marketing margin. Also, the coefficients for mark-up is positive and statistically significant which means that as mark-up increases, the size of the marketing margin also increases due to the increase in selling price. For rice marketers, the coefficients for transport cost and storage cost were positive and significant implying that a decrease in their values will lead to a corresponding reduction in the size of the marketing margin. Also, the coefficients of mark-up is positive and statistically significant which means that as mark-up increases, the size of the marketing margin also increases due to the increase in the selling price. The F ration indicates that the combined effects of the entire explanatory variables on the size of the marketing

margin (Y) were significant implying that the model is adequate for use in further analysis. These findings agree with that of Kassim (2012) who observed that the interplay of series of marketing activities causes variation in the marketing margin among the marketers of food grains.

The result of determinants of price differentials shows that the coefficients of transport cost, storage cost, mark-up were positive and significant at 1% level of significance implying that the higher the transport cost and storage cost, the more or higher the selling price differential. These findings concur with Oladapo *et al.* (2007) and Musa *et al.* (2013) who observed that transportation cost accounted for a very significant part of the total marketing cost. That they are all positive also shows that the activities of the market associations have not helped to reduce the selling price differentials rather they contribute to its increase. The results also show that the transport and middlemen's mark-up contribute more to the selling price differentials as indicated by their coefficients

This Gini coefficients imply that there is a high level of inequality in the sales revenue of respondents and consequently high level of concentration in few hands for the rice and beans marketing in the study area. This is in accordance with Ekunwe and Alufohai (2009) which also showed the inequality in the market structure for poultry egg marketing by the high level of concentration in the market as seen in the estimate of the Gini coefficient. It however conflicts with Kassim (2012) who reported that cowpea marketers were slightly concentrated in the South- Western Nigeria while that of polished rice marketers were not so concentrated which implied that there was

equality or evenness in the distribution of cowpea and polished rice among marketers

The result of the constraints identified among rice and beans marketers are in close agreement with those of Eze *et al.* (2010) and Musa *et al.* (2013) who reported inadequate storage facilities, high transportation costs, lack of capital and credit facilities and lack of adequate agricultural marketing information as constraints facing agricultural marketing.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study also showed that market associations in rice and beans marketing do not regulate supply or influence the prices of rice and beans but rather promote business through the arranging of group transport, group storage, bulk purchase and supply of market information to members. Thus, all these efforts aimed at reduction in marketing costs especially transport costs and improving market information will reduce marketing margin and improve price efficiency of the marketers. The study further showed that rice and beans marketing were profitable in Enugu State. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made: The principal factors in the distribution chain should create a favorable environment so that marketing margins could be reduced to the barest minimum in the zone. Also, the quality and the number of food storage facilities should be stepped up so as to extend the longevity and enhance the quality of rice and beans in the area. There should be provision of adequate transportation facilities especially by the government so as to reduce marketing costs on the part of transportation. High transportation costs leads to low profit margin and increase in the marketing margin. The activities of market associations in interfering with the

price mechanisms should be minimized for efficient marketing.

## REFERENCES

- Agbebi F. O. and Fagbote T. A. 2012. The role of Middlemen in Fish Marketing in Igbokoda Fish Market, Ondo State, South Western Nigeria, *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* 1: 880-888.
- Ekunwe, P. A. and Alufohai, G. O. 2009. Economics of Poultry Egg Marketing in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Poultry Science* 8: 166 -169.
- ENADEP 2009. Enugu State Agricultural Development Programme, Annual Report. 30pp.
- Eze. S. O.; Onwubuya, E. A. and Ezech, A. N. 2010. Women Marketers Perceived Constraints on Selected Agricultural Produce Marketing in Enugu South Area: Challenges of Extension Training for Women Groups in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Agro-Science Journal of Tropical Agriculture Food Environment and Extension*, 9: 215-222.
- Ezike, J. O. 1998. "Delineation of old and new Enugu State", *Bulletin – unpublished: Land and Survey*, Ministry of works, Enugu.
- Kassim, A. A. 2012. *Economics of Marketing of Food Grains in South Western Nigeria*, Department Nueva Epoca, 21: 373 -390.
- Kohls, R.L. and Uhl J. N. (1990). *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed; New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Lawal, W. L. and Idega, E. O. 2004. Analysis of Fish Marketing in Benue State. *A Paper Presented at 2001 Annual Conference of Association of Agricultural Economists (NAAE) held at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria*. November 3 – 7.
- Musa, Y. N., Reuben, J. and Magaji, I. Y. 2013. Problems associated with Agricultural Produce Marketing in Nigeria: the experience of milled rice women marketers from Southern Taraba State, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Management*, 2 (1): 22 – 26.
- National Bureau of Statistics. 2012. Annual abstract of statistics 2012. Federal republic of Nigeria, 169pp.
- Nwaizugbo, I. C. 2004. *Principles of Marketing*, Enugu – Southeast Nigeria: New Generation Ventures Limited. 150pp.
- Nwankwo, S. T. 2000. "Analysis of the role of market associations and middlemen in the marketing of Food stuff in Abia State" Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Dept. of Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. 120pp.
- Oladapo M. O., Momoh, S., Yusuf, S. and Awoyinka, Y. 2007. Marketing Margin and Spatial Pricing Efficiency of Pineapple in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Marketing* 1:14 -22.
- Olukosi, J. O.; Isitor, S. U. and Ode, M. O. 2007. *Introduction to Agricultural Marketing and Prices: Principles and Applications*. Abuja, Nigeria: Living Books Series, G U Publications. 116pp.
- Onyeabor, E. N. 2009. *Marketing and Distribution channels; Agricultural Marketing for Developing Economics*; Enugu Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd; 220pp.
- Uduji, J. I., Oyaka, J. O. and Edicha, M. I. 2012. Strategic Marketing for Agricultural Produce in Nigeria. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development*, 18:45-55