AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

RICE FARMERS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES OF THE VALUE CHAIN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN ANAMBRA STATE

Obiora, Charles Chukwuma (PhD)
charlesobiora113@gmail.com; 07032472530
Ojogbane, Joseph Adams
Eze, Ogochukwu M (PhD)
Okechukwu, frances O.
Anene, Kelvin Ndubuisi
Department of Agric. Edu. Federal College of Education (Technical) Asaba
Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study evaluated the level of satisfaction of the beneficiary farmers on the implementation of the value chain development programme in Anambra State. The 240 beneficiary rice farmers were used as the population of the study. The method of data collection was through the use of questionnaire and structured interview. The data collected was analyzed using the descriptive statistics such as the mean and the standard deviation. The study revealed that the beneficiaries were satisfied with the following implementation strategies such as qualification requirements (Ẋ = 4.71), pattern of filed staff recruitment (Ẋ - 4.54; SD), selection process of the rice farmers (Ẋ = 4.43), achievements of the programme's mission statement and objectives (Ẋ = 3.83), benefits from the programme (Ẋ = 3.76), pattern of advertisements for the programme enrollment (Ẋ = 3.65) and frequency of training received (Ẋ = 3.40).

Keywords: Rice Farmers; Satisfaction; Implementation Strategies; Value Chain Development Programme.

Introduction

Agriculture is mostly seen as an integrated approach designed to improving the environment and wellbeing of the people of the community (Dooember, et al, 2020). The first step in the process of agricultural development is to abandon the view of agriculture in pre-modern or traditional societies as essential static. However, the problem of Agricultural development is not that of transforming a static agricultural sector into a modem, dynamic or progressive: sector, but of accelerating theater of increase in agricultural and productivity consistent with the growth of other sectors of a modernizing economy. For the purpose of this work the Value Chain Development Programme which is one of the agricultural programmes introduced by the government of Nigeria to promote agricultural productivity, national economic development is considered.

Value chain comprises full range of activities and Services required to bring a particular product through the different phases of production and delivery., to the final consumers (International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 2018) The term value chain also refers to the importance, that value is

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

added to products across one link to the next one in the chain through the combination of knowledge and resources (Dubey Rajeev Swatentra, Abhishek and Nikhil, 2020; Ovidijus, 2013). Value chain is a business model that describes full range of activities needed in creating a product or service (Tardi and Brock. 2020). It is a concept describing the full chain of a business's activities in the creation of a product ranging from the initial reception of materials all the way through its delivery to market, and everything in between (Chai, 2021). From the organizational and institutional view, a value chain can be analyzed as the formal and informal arrangements that allow coordination and collaboration links across actors and at different points along the chain (IFAD, 2018).

United States Agency for International Development (2020) and Inter-American Development Bank (2013) described it as a full range of activities that are required to bring a product or service from its conception to its end use, including all the market channels available to all firms. A value chain in agriculture identifies the set of actors and activities that bring a basic agricultural product from production in the field to final consumption, where at each stage value is added to the product (Danish Refugee Council (DRC), 2020). It is a set of linked activities that work to add value to a product, and consists of actors and actions that can improve a product while linking commodity producers to processors and markets (Funmilola, Olawale and Nwadihi, 2018). It is an economic system around a particular commercial product with focus on value addition along sequence of activities of providing inputs, producing-transforming, marketing and consumption. A value chain focuses on the degree of coordination and collaboration between the value chain operators or actors and business model tor particular commercial product (FAO, 2014).

According to SANREM (2020), value chain can be a vertical linking or a network between various independent business organizations and can involve processing, packaging, storage, transport and distribution. It works better when the actors involved cooperate to produce higher-quality products and generate more income for all participants along the chain, as opposed to the simplest kinds of value chains, in which producers and buyers exchange only price information (Norton, 2014). It encompasses the flow of products, knowledge and information, finance, payments, and the social capital needed to organize the producers and communities. Example, for firms that produce goods and services, a value chain operation will comprise the steps that are involved in bringing a product from conception to distribution, and everything in between, such as procurement of raw materials, manufacturing, and marketing activities. Information needed in value chain is especially important to all value chain actors, and flows in two directions: markets inform producers of price, quantity and quality needs, product handling and technology options, while producers inform processors and markets about quantity of production, locations, and timing and production issues (Norton, 2014),.

Agricultural value chain includes a wide range of activities such as development and dissemination of plant and animal genetic material, input distribution, farmer organization, farm production, post-harvest handling, processing, provision of technologies for

production, grading facilities, cooling and packing technologies, post-harvest local processing, industrial processing, storage, transport, finance, and feedback from customers or markets (Norton, 2014). At the heart of the agricultural value chain concept, is the idea of actors connected along a chain producing and delivering goods to consumers through a sequence of processes (Henriksen, Riisgaard, Ponte, Hartwich and Kormawa 2010). However "vertical" chain cannot function in isolation and an important aspect of the value approach is that it also considers “horizontal” impacts on the chain such as input supply, Finance provision, extension support and the general enabling environment. The approach t been found useful, particularly by donors, in that it has resulted in a consideration of a factors impacting on the ability of farmers to access markets profitably, leading to a range of chain interventions. It is used both for unbearding existing chains and for do identify market opportunities for small farmers (Wikipedia, 2021).

The value chain approach in agricultural development helps identify weak points in the chain and actions to add more value (Norton, 2014), The framework helps organizations identify and group their own business functions into primary and secondary activities (Chai, 2021). Value chain works best when operators cooperate to produce higher-quality products and generate more income for all participants along the chain, as opposed to the simplest kinds of value chain, in which producers and buyers exchange only price information. According to Rex (2013), the value chain approach considers the role of existing chain actors, supporting actors, and the policy environment. It allows the actors to look at current challenges in value chain, as well as the opportunities for improving the efficiency of the value chain and the benefits for everyone involved. Sometimes, participating in a well-functioning value chain brings farmers hot higher incomes alone, but attract young people to farming or persuade them not to leave rural areas by offering better ways to earn money and as well, help the farmer learn new skills and adopt improved practices (Chapota, 2013).

According to International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2012), the Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP) is a six-year agricultural development intervention programme initiated and implemented by the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The programme was designed to improve both cassava and rice value chains for small-scale farmers in six selected states of the Federation Anambra, Benue, Ebonyi, Niger, Ogun and Taraba. The Value Chain Development Programme emerged from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) with Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP) of between 2010 and 2015 periods (IFAD, 2012). The Development with Country Strategic Opportunities Programme which was established on the recommendations of the Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) was Carried out in 2008/2009 April, 2009 by the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) and International Fund for Agricultural Development. The Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) recommendations laid emphases on the future IFAD interventions on Agriculture, with emphasis on the enhancement of productivity and access to market (Fumilola, 2018),

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

The Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP) is anchored on Nigeria governments vision for Agricultural Transformation through commodity value chain approach which was an approach designed to tackle the challenges of smallholder farmers (Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP), 2020). The goal of the programme is to reduce rural poverty, increase food security and accelerate economic growth on a sustainable basis by proffering solutions to limited access to productive assets and inputs, low productivity, limited opportunities for value addition, inadequate support services such as extension services, inability to access rural financial services, inadequate market and infrastructure (Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP), 2020). According to Mgbenika and Mbah (2016), the primary target groups for the VCDP are the poor rural households engaged in cassava and rice value chains. This includes the 15,000 smallholder farmers cultivating up to five hectares of land devoted to cassava and rice, I,680 small-scale processors and 800 traders as direct beneficiaries with emphasis on women and youth; and 22,000 indirect beneficiaries, benefitting largely from the infrastructure improvements, amongst other things.

The Value Chain Development Prouramme is coordinated under the technical responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) and the State Ministries of Agriculture (MoAs) whilst implementation at the national level receives oversight and guidance from the Value Chain Steering Committee (VCSC), Federal Ministry of Agriculture Development (FMARD) as the lead implementing agency, delegates' the function and day-to-day implementation and coordination responsibilities to the National Programme management Unit (NPMU). In each of the selected states, the daily implementation of the programme is handled by the State Programme Management Unit, which ensures effective and efficient implementation of the programme activities at the state and Local Government Area level. The programmne which is domiciled in the Federal Ministry of Agricultures and

Rural Development is implemented through the following components:

- ❖ Agricultural Market Development;
- ❖ Smallholder Productivity Enhancement: and
- ❖ Programme Management and Coordination.

Rice is an important staple food in Nigeria and it is grown in all the States of the Federation and Federal Capital Territory though production varies from State to State and the prevalent types of rice production systems in Nigeria include rain-fed upland, rain-fed lowland, irrigated lowland, deep water floating and mangrove swamp (Chukwudebelu, Igwe and Madukasi, 2015), As a cereal grain, it is the most widely consumed staple food for a large part of the world's human population, especially in Asia (Awika, 2011) and it is one of the commodities with the third-highest worldwide production, after sugarcane and maize. According to Shrestha (2012), rice is more than just a food, as it plays a key role in food security, while at the same time South-East Asian nations have become the leading rice exporting countries. In most Countries, rice cultivation has become the major activity and sources of income for millions of households around the globe.

According to Kadiri, Eze, Orebiyi, Lemchi, Ohajianya and Nwaiwu (2014), rice is an increasingly important crop in Nigeria and it is relatively easy to produce for sale and home consumption. In some areas, there is a long tradition of rice growing but for many, it is considered a luxury food for special occasions only. In terms of comparative advantage, rice can be grown in flooded and not-flooded soils because it has both lowland and upland varieties that can adapt to different agro-climatic and soil conditions (Aja and Aja 2014).

According to Merem, Twumasi, Wesley, Isokpehi, shenge, et al (2017), rice in most of the African countries constitutes a bigger portion of the diet on a regular basis, Aside a handful of nations that enjoy self-sufficiency in rice cultivation, rice consumption surpasses its production and substantial amount of the crop are imported to sustain local demand at the expense of hard- earned foreign currency reserves. Rice is virtually cultivated in most of the agro-ecological zones of the country, as it constitutes one major cereal crop produced by an average Nigerian farmer. According to Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2018), Nigeria is the continent's leading consumer of rice, one of the largest producers of rice in Africa and simultaneously one of the largest rice importers in the world.

According to Global Value Chain Initiative (GVCI) (2007) as cited in Ewuzie, Ifediora and Anctolh (2020), value chain is an arrangement that describes the linkages of participants and their value creating activities that enhance the movement of goods and services from production, processing, marketing to the end user. In agricultural parlance, the term "value chain" is used interchangeably with such terms as supply chain, market system, and agri-food chain, depending on what is being considered. Based on agri-food sector perspective, Drummond and Goodwin (2011), defined value chain as all activities and processes that occur between producers of food and ultimate consumers. According to Donovan, Franzel, Cunha, Gyau and Mithöfer (2015), donor agencies like USAID, FADAMA, and IFAD usage of value chain is in line with World Bank (2010) definition which describes value chain as full range of Value adding activities required to bring a product or service through different phases of Production including the procurement of raw materials and other input. The concept of value was introduced to improve productivity and profitability of the actors in the agricultural sector (Ewuzie, Ifediora and Anctoh. 2020) The notion of agricultural value chain underscores system approach to value added activities where the action of one component in a system affects every other component within the system. According to Ugwuonah (2017), the idea of the value chain is relatively new in agricultural sector it is however, resides at the core of high-impact and sustainable initiatives focused on improving productivity, competitiveness and growth of Small-Medium Enterprises (SMEs).

Recently, most of the agricultural intervention programmes, initiated and implemented in agricultural sectors by both government and non-government agencies (donors) take the value chain approach. The value chain approach has shifted focus and emphasis away from agricultural production to consumer demand, marketing and the coordination of product flow from producer to consumer (Ewuzie, et al, 2020) The value chain concept acknowledges that production must be linked to demand and the

critical role of organizing the flow from farmer to consumer opportunities must be taken into consideration. A value chain links the steps a product takes from the producer to the consumer. It. therefore, includes research and development, input suppliers, production, processing, marketing and finance (Norton, 2014).

An agricultural value chain starts with the provision of farm inputs which include seed, fertilizer and other agro chemicals used in the cultivation of crops (Rex, 2013). All the inputs are provided by the agro input dealers to the farmer who uses them in the production of agricultural crops and livestock. Whereas, according to Ewuzie, et al, (2020), the production component entails the actual production activities which culminates in the usage of farm inputs in a way that it is prescribed by the agricultural technologies for a particular commodity to produce the required produce. Value chains are created for the better understanding of consumer needs to respond to these requirements in better and more strategic way. The trade components entails exchange and distribution activities that are carried on at the primary product level by marketing middlemen, Processing has to do with value addition activities which is concerned with the change in form of the produce. Besides these activities that are central to a value chain, the business environment and provision of allied services also affect the value chain and as such constitute part of the value chain. Activities of the various participants in the value chain are expected to increase the value that is added to the products and Shrestha (2012) further opined that participants' conduct along the chain determines the efficiency and return accruing to each participant.

Since the Value Chain Development Programme began the government has invested a relatively huge sum of money into it. For the fact that the programme is aimed mainly at ensuring food security, improving the standard of living of people by increasing agricultural productivity, it is however necessary to find out if the strategies employed in implementing the programme is satisfactory to the farmers (beneficiaries of the programmes). However the study rests on evaluating the level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries farmers on the programme implementation.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to evaluate the level of satisfaction of beneficiary farmers on the implementation of the value chain development programme in Anambra State.

The Area of Study

The study was conducted in Anambra State, Nigeria. Anambra State is located in South-Eastern region of Nigeria. Anambra State is sub-divided into four Agricultural zones (AZs) namely: Anambra AZ, Awka AZ, Aguata AZ and Onitsha AZ which spread across the twenty-one local Government.

Population of the study

The population of the study included all the 240, rice farmers that benefited from the value chain programme in Anambra State.

Method of data collection

The data for the study were collected from both primary and secondary sources using a

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

structured questionnaire and interview whose items boarder on issues relating to level of farmers satisfaction on perception of the value chain development programme. The programme beneficiaries were asked to indicate on a 4-point likert-type scales their perception on the extent of changes due to the programme's intervention. Their responses were categorized as follows: to great (TGE) = 4, to some extent (TSE) = 3, to little extent (TLE) = 2, and to no extent (TNE) = 1. These valves were added to obtain a value of 10 which was divided by 4 to get a mean score of 2.5 in each case. Hence, mean score ≥ 2.5 was regarded as great change, while any mean score > 2.5 was regarded as no change.

Validity

The instrument for data collection was validated by Dr. (Mrs). V.I Owunna of the Imo State Universal Basic Education Board Owerri.

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability index of the instrument was determined to be 0.82.

Method of data Analysis

The IBM statistical product and Service solution (SPSS), software was used to analyze the data collected.

What are the changes brought about by the value chain development programme on the livelihood of the beneficiary rice farmers in Anambra State?

Beneficiaries' level of satisfaction in the programme implementation strategies

VCP Implementation strategies	beneficiates' level of satisfaction	
	Means (Ẋ) score	SD
Qualification requirements	4.71	0.933
Pattern of field staff recruitment	4.54	0.60
Selection process of programme beneficiaries	4.43	0.747
Achievement of the programme's mission and objectives	3.83	0.743
Benefits derived from the programme	3.76	0.580
Pattern of advertisements for the programme enrollment	3.65	0.770
Frequency of training received	3.40	0.716
Frequency and full payment of programme staff	2.87	0.845
Method of monitoring and evaluation strategy used	2.65	0.694
Method of input disbursement	2.58	0.813
Frequency of input distribution	2.38	0.533
Grand Mean	**3.53**	
Index	**0.71**	

Ẋ ≥ 3.0 – satisfied implementation strategy

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

Beneficiaries level of satisfaction in the implementation strategies of the programme

The table reveals the beneficiary farmers' level of satisfaction in the implementation strategies of the Value Chain Development Programme in Anambra State. As shown in the result. The programme beneficiaries were satisfied with the following implementation strategies: qualification requirements (Ẋ = 4.71; SD =0.933), pattern of field staff recruitment (Ẋ =4.54: SD=0.630), selection process of the beneficiaries (Ẋ = 4,43; SD =0.747), achievements of the programme's mission state and objectives (Ẋ =3.83; SD = 0.743), benefits from the programme (Ẋ = 3.76: SD =0.580), pattern of advertisements for the programme enrollment (Ẋ =3.65: SD =0.770), and frequency of training received (Ẋ =3.40; SD = 0.716). However, the respondents were not satisfied with the frequency and full payment of the programme staff (Ẋ = 2.87: SD= 0.845), methods of monitoring and evaluation strategies used (Ẋ = 2.67: SD 0.694), method of input disbursement (Ẋ =2.58; SD =0.813) and frequency of input distribution (Ẋ =2.38; SD =0.553).

In addition, the result on beneficiaries' level of satisfaction in the implementation strategies of the programme shows that the beneficiaries had grand mean score value of 3.53 and satisfaction index of 0.71. The implication of the results is that the majority (719%) of the beneficiaries were satisfied with the Value Chain Development Programme implementation strategies in Anambra State. Hence, the implementation strategies initiated and implemented by the programme were suitable and favourable. Also, the table reveals that the standard deviation values were less than one in all cases. Therefore, the responses of the beneficiaries on these implementation strategies did not vary so much from the mean, which signifies convergence of views with regards to the implementation strategies in the study area. The finding contradicts Adeogun et al. (2019) who reported that many of these agricultural programmes did not yield anticipated positive results, beneficiaries were not involved in the design of the programmes and in most cases top-bottom approaches were used. Therefore, resulting to beneficiaries" dissatisfaction of the programme since their felt needs were not addressed.

In addition, Daneji (2011) reported that one of the challenges faced by most funded agricultural development intervention programmes in Nigeria are the underachievement and negligence of programmes' objectives and this can result to diversion of inputs intended for the programnes for other purpose; poor implementation strategies, policy and political inconsistency. However, the findings of the study aligns with the finding of Oruonye, Tukura-Ejati-Danladi and Menwo (2021) who reported that the programme intervention in study area has empowered rice farmers especially, those that belong to an organized cooperative society, through which they were able to gain access to extension services and farm inputs. Based on the farmer's benefits, the authors, further concluded and stated that the programme beneficiaries were generally satisfied with the IFAD-VCDP programme in the study area.

Conclusion

The study reveals that the beneficiaries were satisfied with the following implementation

strategies: qualification requirements (Ẋ = 4.71), pattern of filed staff recruitment (Ẋ - 4.54; SD), selection process of the rice farmers (Ẋ = 4.43), achievements of the programme's mission statement and objectives (Ẋ = 3.83), benefits from the programme (Ẋ = 3.76), pattern of advertisements for the programme enrollment (Ẋ = 3.65) and frequency of training received (Ẋ = 3.40).

Recommendations

The programme intervention brought about significant changes in the livelihood of farmers in the area of increase in income access to improved rice varieties and economic well-being and satisfaction of basic needs and poverty reduction among others .

It is however adviced that adequate orientation regarding the expected changes and impact of the programme should be made so as to courage more participation of rice farmers on the value chain programme. The orientation should be done through the mass media, town and community meetings and religious gatherings.

REFERENCES

Aja, J. & Aja, F.C (2014). Socio-economic determinants of small-scale rice farmers' output in Abuja, Nigeria. Asia Journal of Rural Development, 4(1), 16-24.

Awika, J.M (2011). Major cereal grains production and use around the world. ACS symposium series, 1089, 1-13.

Amaechina, EC & Eboh, EC (2017) Resource use efficiency in rice production in the lower Anamabra irrigation project, Nigeria: Jouranl of Development and Agricultural economics 9, no.8 (2017):234-242.

Babatunde, M.M., Abraham, F., Jubril, O.A., (2017). Effects of Fadama III programme on dry-session vegetable growers in Kwara State, Nigeria kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences. 38(2), 163-168.

Chapota, R (2013). The role of radio in the agricultural value chain approach: The case of the groundnut value chain in Malawi. Retrieved on August 29, 2021 from https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/bitstream/handle/10625/52685/IDL-52685.pdf

Chia, W. (2021). What is value chain? Retrieved August 29, 2021 from httpss://searchcio.tech target.com/definition/value-chain

Danish Refuge Council (DRC) (2020). Analysis of key value chains in the agriculture and food-processing sector. Retrieved on August 23rd 2022 from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/file/resources/DRC-Value-Chain-Analysis%20Diyala. Pdf

Donovan,J., Franzel, S., Cunha, M., Gyua, A., & Mithofer, D (2015). Guides for Value chain development: a comprarative review. Journal of agribusiness in development and emerging economics, 5(1), 2-23.

Dooember, V.I., Olawale, E.O & David, O. (2020). Effect of value chain development programme on income and food security of rice farmers in Yewa North and Ijebu North-East, Ogun State, Nigeria.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) Research Report submitted to centre for sustainable Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria, pp1-34

Drummond, H.E & Goodwin, J.W., (2011), Agricultural Economics (3rd Edition): University of florida: Person limited

Dubey, S.K., Rajeev, S., Swatentra, P.S., Abhishek, M & Nikhil, V.S (2020). A brief study of value chain and supply chain. Retrieved on August 29,2021 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344374264_a_brief_study_of_value_chain_and_supply_chain

Elum, Z.A & Obiajunwa, U. (2020). Analysis of institutional credit accessibility among small holder poultry farmers in rivers state, Nigeria Journal of development and agricultural economics, 14(2), 30-40.

Ewuzie, C.O., Ifediora, C.U & anetoh, J.C. (2020). Profitability of actors in rice value chain in Nigeria: A comparative analysis. International journal of innovation research and advanced studies (IJIRAS), 7(7), 59-65.

Food and Agriculture organization (FAO) (2018). Nigeria at a glance. Retrieved on January 2021 from http://www.fao.org/nigeria/fao-in-nigeria/nigeria-at-a-glance/en/

Food and Agriculture Organization Statistical Databse (FAOSTAT) (2014). Developing a sustainable food value chain. Retrieved on 23rd August 2021 from http://www.fao.org/3/i3953e/i3953.pdf

Funmilola, O.T., Olawale, O. & Nwadihi, M (2018). Effect of IFED value chain development programme on economic welfare of smallholder rice and cassava producers in Anambra State, Nigeria. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328282907

Global Value chain Chain Initiative (2007). Institute of development studies. Retrieved on August 21,2021 from: www.ids.ac.uk/global valuechains/index.html.

Grigg, D.B (2013). "The World Food problem." In pacione, M. (ed), progress in agricultural Geography, Croom Helm, London. Pp.239-263.

Henriksen, L.F., Riisgaard, L., Ponte, S.., Hartwich, F & Kormawa, P. (2010), Agro-food value chain interventions in Asia: a review and analysis of case studies. Retrieved on August 29, 2021 from https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2011-01/workomgpaper_vc_asiafinal_0pdf.

International fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (20166). Investing in rural people in Nigeria. Retrieved on 20th of July, 2020 from https://www.ifad.org/documents/38714170/39972302/investing+rural+people+Nigeria-e.pdf/d2c0bc12-5c46-4e92-9d95-1c4dd747fda.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2018). Agricultural Value chains and its contribution to sustainable Development Goals: The case of high Value Chains on Hills and Mountain Area (HVAP) in Nepal. Retrieved on Augusut 29, 2021 from https://ic-sd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Antonio-wills-field-practicum-report-HVAP-Nepal-082018.pdf.

Isah, A.I. & Muhammad, S.M.J (2021). Impact of Fadma III Additional Financing (AF) on the yield and income of beneficiaries in some selected Local Government Areas of Sokoto State, Nigeria Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, 13(1),44-50.

Kadiri, F.A ,. Eze, C.C., Orebiyi, J.S., Lemchi, J.I.,Ohajianya, D.O & Nwaiwu, I.U. (2014). Technical efficiency in paddy rice production in Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Global Journal of Agricultural Research 2(2),33-43.

Merem, E.C., Twumasi, Y., Wesely, J., Isokpehi, P., Shenge, M., Fageir, S., Crisler M., Romorno, C., Hines, A., Hirse, G., Ochai, S., Leggett, S., Nwagboso, E. (2017). Analyzing rice production issues in the Niger State Area of Nigeria's middle belt. Food and public Health, 7(1), 7-22.

Mgbenka, R.N & Mbah, E.N (2016). A review of smallholder farming in Nigeria: Need for transformation. European Centre for Research and Development, 3(2) 43-54.

Norton, R. (2014). Agricultural value chains: A game changer for small holders. Retrieved on August 24th from https://www.devex.com/news/agricultural-value-chains-a-game-changer-for-small-holders-83981.

Ogbonna, M.O & Nwaobiala, C.U. (2015). Evaluation of participation and poverty level of National Fadama III development project among rural farm women in Gombe State, Nigeria. Journal of agriculture and food science, 3(6), 83-90.

Ovidijus, J. (2013) Value Chain analysis. Retrieved on August 29, 2021 from https://strategicmanagementinsight.com/tools/value-chain-analysis.html.

Rex, C. (2013). Role of radio in the agricultural value chain approach: the case of the groundnut value chain in malawi . Retrieved on August 29,2021 from https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/bitstream/handle/10625/52685/IDL-52685.pdf.

Sanrem (20200. Agriculture and value chain. Retrieved on 23rd August, from https://sanremafric a.org/agriculture-and-value-chains/

Tardi, C. & Brock, T. (2020). Value chain. Accessed on August 29,2021 from https://www.investopedia.com/terms/v/valuechain.asp#citation-1

Ugwuonah, G.E. (2017). Market-led approach to agricultural value chain development: issues in investment and wealth creation. University of Nigeria, Inaugural Lecture, Nsukka University of Nigeria press Ltd.

Utiang , P.U. (2017). Agricultural value chain development knowledge management and communication. Retrieved on October 18, 2022 from file:///C://Users/master/appdata/Local/Temp/Agricultural Value Chain Development Knowledge Management communication by utiangp.ugbe.pdf

Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP) (2020). Who we are. Retrieved on August 30th, 2021 from https://vcdpnigeria.org/who-we-are/

Wikipedia (2021). Agricultural value chain. Retrieved on August 29, 2021 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agricultural-value-chain#Value-Chain-methodologies.

World Bank (2010). Building competitiveness in Africa's Agriculture: A guide to value chain concepts and applications: Discussion paper. Washington. D.C