| 1 | Original Research Article |
|---|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Analysis of post-harvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue |
| 4 | State, Nigeria |
| 5 | |
| 6 | ABSTRACT |
| 7 | The study analyzed the post-harvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue state, Nigeria. It |

ascertained the level of postharvest losses of yam, identified the factors precipitating postharvest 8 losses of yam identified the strategies adopted by yam farmers for reduction of postharvest losses 9 of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State, Nigeria. The study consisted of a total sample size of 10 two hundred and four (204) yam farmers drawn from three local government areas of North-East 11 12 Zone of Benue state. The result identified pest attack, storage method, temperature, disease and infection, poor transportation, theft, underdeveloped market and exposure of yam to sunlight as 13 factors precipitating post-harvest losses in the area. It also shows the result of the assessment of 14 yam farmers in the study area regarding the level of losses they experience at various stages of 15 yam postharvest activities. The value of the coefficient of multiple determinants (R^2), is 0808, 16 which implies that about 80.8% of the postharvest losses of yam in the study area is explained by 17 the explanatory variables included in the model. The F-statistic of the lead equation is significant 18 at 1% (28.122). Coefficients of pest attack disease and infections of yam, poor transportation 19 facility, poor handling method used, excessive exposure of yam to sunlight, werepositively 20 21 related to postharvest losses of yam in the study area at 1% level of significant. Coefficient of storage method, temperature of the area and theft of yam in the study area were positive and 22 significant to postharvest losses of vam at 5% level of significant. Given that, the computed F-23 value (28.122), was significantly higher than the tabulated F-value (9.33), at 1% level of 24 significance, and (3.11) at 5% level of significance; the null hypothesis was therefore rejected 25 and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. The study recommends provision of yam flour 26 27 processing factory, which will provide a ready yam market that will reduce postharvest losses of yams and also increase the economic value of yams in the area. 28

29

30

Introduction

The phenomenon of postharvest losses of crop is an issue of great concern in the global 31 community. This is essentially because, about one-third of the food produced in the world 32 for human consumption every year, which is approximately 1.3 billion tones gets lost 33 after harvest (FAO, 2018). By implication, 30% to 40% of all food crops produced in the 34 world for human consumption is never consumed due to quantitative and qualitative 35 losses, which occur as food crop passes through postharvest chain or system. 36

37 Postharvest loss of food means the measurable quantitative and qualitative food losses in the postharvest chain or system. The postharvest system comprises of interconnected 38 activities from the time of crop harvest through storage, processing, marketing and 39 preparation, to the final decision by the consumer to eat or discard the food (Kiaya, 40 2014). Qualitative food losses involve alteration in the physical condition or 41 characteristics of food produce which affect the nutrient/caloric composition and the 42 edibility of the food produce while quantitative food losses involve losses in terms of 43 volume or amount of food product. It is worthy of note that quantitative food loss in the 44 postharvest food chain is more common in developing countries, including Nigeria and 45 Benue State (Kitinoja & Gorny, 1999). Quantitative and qualitative food losses do occur 46 at any stage in the postharvest chain. Also, economic losses can occur, as a subset of 47 postharvest loss, in the event where the produce is subsequently restricted to a lower 48 market value due to either the qualitative or quantitative loss. When this occurs, the 49 income of the producers and/or produce marketers is directly affected. This can 50 invariably affect their capacity to be effective in the next food production season and 51 thereby, ensure continues availability of sufficient and quality food for their households. 52

53

Benue state is acclaimed the largest producer of yam in Nigeria and West Africa at large 54 (Phillips, Ogbonna, Etudaiye, Mignouna & Siwoku, 2013:15), with the largest yam 55 56 market (Zaki Biam yam market) in Benue North-East Zone and other numerous yam markets across the state. The foregoing indicates a high level of yam production and yam 57 marketing activities in Benue and North-East Zone of Benue State in particular. This 58 prospect raises the general expectation that, the available yam markets should provide an 59 60 avenue whereby yam farming households can sale surplus yam produce so as to generate enormous financial income, which will translate into a good standard of living and also 61 ensure the continuous availability of sufficient quality food for household consumption. 62

63

However, the findings of Verter and Becvarova (2014), Ivanda, Igbokwe and Olatunji
(2015) and Abu and Soom (2016), on the condition of farming households in Benue,
reveals that over 30% of yam farming households in Benue are still experiencing low
income from yam production and food insecurity. This findings suggests that, there might

be a prevailing significant level of postharvest losses of yam which may have been 68 negatively affecting the standard of living and food security of yam farming households 69 70 in North-East Zone of Benue State. Again, several studies such as: Gernah, Ukevima, Ikya, Ode and Ogunbande (2013), Adamu, Mada and Kabri (2014), Sanginga and IITA 71 (2015), FAO (2018) and even studies that have been situated in the study area like: Verter 72 and Becvarova (2014), Ivanda, Igbokwe and Olatunji (2015) and Abu and Soom (2016) 73 have not established the factors precipitating postharvest losses of yams in the study area, 74 strategies adopted by yam farmers to reduce postharvest losses of yam, the level of the 75 losses of vam farming households in the study area. 76

77

78 **Objectives of the study**

The foregoing underscores an existing knowledge gap that needs to be filled. Hence thestudy:

- 1. ascertained the level of postharvest losses of yam,
- 82 2. determined the factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam and
- 3. identified strategies adopted by yam farmers for reduction of postharvest losses of
 yam in North-East Zone of Benue State, Nigeria.
- 85

86 Hypothesis

Pest attack, poor storage, temperature, disease and infections, long distance from farm to yam barn/market, poor transportation facility, theft, poor handling, sprouting, destruction from crises, underdeveloped market and excessive exposure of yam to sunlight are not factors precipitating postharvest loss of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State, Nigeria.

91 Materials and Methods

The study area is Benue North-East Zone. This zone was established as a geo-political demarcation alone side Benue North-West Zone and Benue South Zone. The Benue North-East Zone, other words known as Zone A, is comprised of seven Local Government Areas namely: Kwande, Logo, Vandeikya, Katsina-Ala, Konshisha, Ukum and Ushongo. The population of Benue North-East Zone is estimated at 3,234,660, whereas, an estimated figure of 285,454 has been recorded as regular households in the

- Zone (National Population Commission, 2009). The State lies roughly within the lower
 river Benue in the middle belt region of Nigeria, lying between Latitudes 6.5° and 8.5°
 North and Longitudes 7.47° N and 10⁰ East.
- 101
- 102Figure 1: Map of Benue State Showing Distribution of Local Government Areas by103Zones



104

105

106 Figure 2: Crop Production map of Benue State



- 108
- 109

The population of study consists of all yam farming households in North-East Zone of 110 Benue State, Nigeria made up of seven (7) Local Government Areas. The study 111 purposively selected three (3) local government areas (Ukum, Katsina-Ala and Logo) that 112 are most prominent in yam production in North-East Zone of Benue State. The three 113 Local Government Areas have a total of 1735 yam farming Households (Yam Farmers 114 Association, 2018). Four (4) council wards were randomly selected from each of the 115 selected local government areas, then seventeen (17) respondents were selected from 116 each of the council wards. This gave a total sample size of two hundred and four (204) 117 respondents. Primary data was obtained from fieldwork using questionnaire and focused 118 119 group discussion methods. Descriptive statistics were used to achieve the objectives of the study while multiple regression analysis were used to text the hypothesis of the study 120

- 121
- 122
- 123

| 124 | Model Specification |
|-----|--|
| 125 | For Hypothesis 1 we specify multiple regression model thus; |
| 126 | Mathematical approach of the model; |
| 127 | $Y = F(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, X_{10}, X_{11}, X_{12}) $ (1) |
| 128 | Econometric approach of the model; |
| 129 | Linear model; |
| 130 | $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{12} X_{12} + ei$ |
| 131 | (2) |
| 132 | Exponential model; |
| 133 | $LogY = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{10$ |
| 134 | ei (3) |
| 135 | Semi-log model; |
| 136 | $Y = \beta_0 + \log$ |
| 137 | $\beta_1X_1 + log\beta_2X_2 + log\beta_3X_3 + log\beta_4X_4 + log\beta_5X_5 + log\beta_6X_6 + log\beta_7X_7 + log\beta_8X_8 + log\beta_9X_9 + log\beta_{10}X_1 + log\beta_{10}X_1 + log\beta_{10}X_1 + log\beta_{10}X_1 + log\beta_{10}X_2 + log\beta_{10}X_1 + log\beta$ |
| 138 | $_{0}+\log\beta_{11}X_{11}+\log\beta_{12}X_{12}+ei$ (4) |
| 139 | Double log; |
| 140 | $LogY = \beta_0 + log\beta_1X_1 + log\beta_2X_2 + log\beta_3X_3 + log\beta_4X_4 + log\beta_5X_5 + log\beta_6X_6 + log\beta_7X_7 + log\beta_8X_8 + log$ |
| 141 | $\beta_{9}X_{9} + \log\beta_{10}X_{10} + \log\beta_{11}X_{11} + \log\beta_{12}X_{12} + ei(5)$ |
| 142 | Where; |
| | |
| 143 | Y = Yam Post-harvest loss (qtg) |
| 144 | X_1 = Pest attack; X_2 = Poor storage and processing facilities; X_3 = Temperature of the |
| 145 | area; X_4 = Diseases and infections; X_5 = Long distance from farm to yam barn/market; X_6 |
| 146 | = Poor transportation facilities; X_7 = Theft of yam; X_8 = Poor handling of yam; X_9 = |
| 147 | Sprouting; X_{10} =Destruction due to crisis; X_{11} = Underdeveloped market; X_{12} = |
| 148 | Excessive exposure of yam to sunlight; $b_0 = intercept$; $b_1 - b_{12} = parameters estimate$; $ei =$ |
| 149 | error term, |

150 **Result and Discussion**

151 Factors Precipitating Postharvest Losses of Yam in North-East Zone of Benue State

- 152 153
- Table 1: Factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Pest Attack | 198 | 97 |
| Storage method | 202 | 99 |
| Temperature | 192 | 94 |
| Disease and Infection | 102 | 50 |
| Distance | 98 | 48 |
| Poor Transportation | 164 | 80 |
| Theft | 92 | 45 |
| Handling of yams | 182 | 89 |
| Sprouting | 68 | 33 |
| Destruction from Crises | 192 | 94 |
| Underdeveloped Market | 168 | 82 |
| Exposure of Yam to Sunlight | 201 | 99 |

- 154 155
- 156

The result on table 1 shows the opinion of yam farmers on factors that precipitate postharvest losses of yam in the study area. The result reveal that storage method used 99% (202) is the major cause of postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State. All the Focused Group Discussants in both Logo and Ukum Local Government Areas also submitted unanimously that poor storage is a major factor that precipitates postharvest loss of yam along other factors such as: poor handling method, destruction from crises, attack by pest, theft and fire disaster. The discussants noted accordingly that, the major storage method employed in the study area is the barn, which is basically a traditional method of yam storage. Many of the discussants in both groups however, had little knowledge about modern/improved methods of yam storage. This is consistent with the findings of Osunde (2008), MFCL et al. (2004), Opara (2003) and FAO (1998) that, yam barn is the principal traditional yam storage structure in the yam producing areas, including Nigeria and Benue State.

The result on table 1 also reveals that, storage operations of yam farmers in the study area 170 may have been characterized by poor storage management in which case, they usually 171 fail to effectively monitor by regular inspection so as to prevent pest attack 97% (198) on 172 their stored yams and also reduce temperature 94% (192) in the barn so as to prevent yam 173 rot. This finding is in agreement with the findings of Opara (2003) on "yams postharvest 174 operation" by which he identified three main necessary conditions for successful yam 175 storage, which will involve minimal losses and they include: ventilation, reduction of 176 temperature and regular inspection of the stored yam. The following submission by a 177 discussant from Mbater council ward in Logo Local Government Area brings to light the 178 reason for yam losses during storage in the study area: 179

> "For me, I usually get large yam harvest and I also store many yams, mostly in the barn, arranged in hips on the ground. So, regular checking on the yams becomes a problem and as a result, many times I notice pests like termites and rats attack my yams and even diseases also affects the yams".

Again, the result on table 1 indicates that exposure of yams to sunlight 99% (201) is another major cause of postharvest loss of yam in the study area as almost all of the sampled respondents concurred to this opinion. It is clear from this result that, such

180

181

182

183

184

exposure may have begun right at the time of harvesting where, following poor handling 189 89% (182), yams are left under the sun for a long time especially in situations where 190 there is shortage of work force during harvest. Understandably, therefore, when yams are 191 192 exposed to sunlight in this manner and days after on account of yam curing practice, there is always a tendency for yam rot and hence losses. This is because, the length of time for 193 proper curing cannot be precisely defined (FAO, 1998) and it depends on several factors 194 such as: condition of the yam at harvest, season and temperature of the environment. 195 When these factors at harvest and during yam curing are not effectively controlled, 196 exposure of yam to sunlight at harvest and during yam curing can easily become 197 excessive and thus yam rot and loss will be inevitable. 198

Furthermore, excessive exposure of yam to sunlight, which precipitates yam losses in the study area, occurs at the market setting. Given market activities of off-loading and loading of yams in the sun and the underdeveloped physical market structures in which yams are stored in the market for transaction, yam rot and losses becomes inevitable. This situation is captured in figure 4.1 below:

- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208

Figure 4.1: Loading of yams under the sunlight at Ukum yam market



Source: Field survey, 2018.

211

212

Interestingly, virtually all of the discussants in Logo Local Government Area 213 unanimously submitted that, the underdeveloped market structures provide ground for 214 market security persons to steal yams that are kept under their watch. That, one day of 215 security watch equals to one yam loss. The discussants averred that, this situation usually 216 compels yam farmers who sell their yams at the market to dispose their yams at subsided 217 218 rates, so as to avoid high economic loss. This establishes therefore, that yam losses are incurred from theft 45% (92) as a result of underdeveloped market structure 82% (168) in 219 the study area. 220

Table 1 also reveals that destruction from crises 94% (192) is another factor, which precipitates postharvest loss of yam in the study area. This result has been confirmed by the submission of a discussant from Tswarev ward in Logo Local Government Area that:

224Out of ten wards in Logo Local Government Area, four225wards which include: Tombo, Mbagber,226Ukemberega/Tswarev and part of Iwuran have been

227 228

229 230 displaced, due to the herdsmen-farmer crises. Some of the residence and farms are occupied by Fulani. The herdsmen usually attack, destroy and burn yams in the barn and also expose some to their cattle to eat.

This finding corroborates the submission of Silas (2018) from his assessment of the 231 conflicts between Fulani-herdsmen and farmers in Kwara State of Nigeria that, food 232 crops which were cultivated on about 500 hectares of land with an estimated value of 233 N200 million was burned. This agrees with the position of FAO (2000) that, the impact 234 of conflict on agricultural practice, food security and standard of living of rural farmers 235 can be understandably placed in the context of the nature of contemporary conflicts 236 which are increasingly characterized by intra-country conflict, in which case, they are 237 usually fought in the countryside and/or rural areas rather than cities. Therefore, such 238 conflicts tend to have devastating effect on the rural population and agriculture which 239 goes to affect their standard of living including food availability and accessibility. 240 Nevertheless, all the discussants from the two groups were in agreement that many 241 farmers do move out their harvested produce at the rumour of potential attack, thereby, 242 minimizing the level of postharvest loss they incur during crises. 243

In the final analysis, therefore, it can be seen that factors such as: pest attack, storage method use and poor storage management, excessive exposure of yams to sunlight, destruction from crises, underdeveloped market, poor harvesting methods and temperature seem to be the factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State.

249

251 Level of Postharvest Losses of Yam in North-East Zone of Benue State

This section contains analysis of the opinions of respondents on the level of postharvest

254

255

Table 2: Level of postharvest losses of yam during postharvest activities in the 2016/2017yam farming season in North-East Zone of Benue State

| Quantity of Yam Loss (Tubers) | Frequency | Percentage (%) | Level of Losses | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Level of Losses during Handling | | | | |
| 1-50 | 181 | 88.7 | Low ⁺ | |
| 51 - 100 | 19 | 9.3 | High | |
| 101 and Above | 4 | 2.0 | Very High | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | | |
| Level of Losses during Storage | | | | |
| 1 - 50 | 189 | 92.6 | Low ⁺ | |
| 51 - 100 | 13 | 6.4 | High | |
| 101 and Above | 2 | 1.0 | Very High | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | | |
| Level of Losses during Transpo | ortation | | | |
| 1 - 50 | 182 | 89.2 | Low ⁺ | |
| 51 - 100 | 17 | 8.3 | High | |
| 101 and Above | 5 | 2.5 | Very High | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | | |
| Level of Losses during Sorting | | | | |
| 1 – 50 | 180 | 88.2 | Low ⁺ | |
| 51 - 100 | 20 | 9.8 | High | |
| 101 and Above | 4 | 2.0 | Very High | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | | |
| Level of Losses during Marketing | | | | |
| 1 – 50 | 17 | 8.3 | Low | |
| 51 - 100 | 186 | 91.2 | High^+ | |
| 101 and Above | 1 | 0.5 | Very High | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | | |
| General Average loss=10.5% | | | | |

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

258

Table 2 shows the result of the assessment of yam farmers in the study area regarding the level of losses they experience at various stages of yam postharvest activities such as: harvesting, storage, transportation, sorting and marketing. The result revealed that greater losses are incurred during marketing of yam. This is an indication that there are no

losses of yams in the study area.

²⁵⁶ 257

263 readily available markets and that farmers are not linked to buyers. This confirms the assertions of Nwafor et al. (2019) that farmers are in need of market linkages. The high 264 level of losses during marketing could also be for the fact that farmers find difficult to 265 carry their produce home at the close of the day, instead they chose to dispose it at any 266 price or better still abandon them in the market place in other not to spend another money 267 carrying them home. This calls for an organized marketing extension services in the area. 268 This result is consistent with findings of Nwafor *et al.* (2019) that reduction in the 269 volume of postharvest losses of root and tuber crop production is dependent on the 270 agricultural marketing extension services available to farmers in the study area. 271

Majority of the farmers experienced low level of losses during other activities except 273 marketing. This could be because of many years of experience and constant practice. The 274 farmers over the years have learnt to carry out yam production activities with minimal 275 losses. Handling of yams cuts across all other postharvest activities mentioned above. 276 There is no gain therefore, saving that, the manner by which yams are handled , 277 especially during harvesting, which is an activity that necessarily precedes other 278 postharvest activities can have serious implication for virtually all the postharvest 279 activities that follows. Improper handling of yams during harvest like leaving harvested 280 yams under the sunlight for a long period may predispose yams to easy bruising or injury 281 during yam transportation and sorting. 282

This finding confirms the findings of Ahmed and Rustagi (1987) from their study on marketing and price incentives in Africa and Asian countries that, food marketing by farming households in Nigeria mostly in the immediate postharvest period usually involves a lot of costs.

287

272

289 Strategies Adopted by Yam Farmers to Reduce Postharvest Losses of Yam in

290 North-East Zone of Benue State

291Table 3: Strategies adopted by yam farmers for reduction of postharvest losses of292yam in North-East Zone of Benue State

| Opinion | Frequency | Percentage (%) | |
|--|-----------|----------------|--|
| Adoption of modern storage facilities | | | |
| Not at All | 22 | 10.8 | |
| Sometimes | 92 | 45.1 | |
| Oftentimes | 46 | 22.5 | |
| Always | 44 | 21.6 | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | |
| market linkages and farm-gate selling | | | |
| Not at All | 56 | 27.5 | |
| Sometimes | 51 | 25.0 | |
| Oftentimes | 71 | 34.8 | |
| Always | 26 | 12.7 | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | |
| curing after harvest | | | |
| Not at All | 29 | 14.2 | |
| Sometimes | 67 | 32.8 | |
| Oftentimes | 37 | 18.1 | |
| Always | 71 | 34.8 | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | |
| Application of Fungicide and Pesticide | | | |
| Not at All | 9 | 4.4 | |
| Sometimes | 77 | 37.7 | |
| Oftentimes | 63 | 30.9 | |
| Always | 55 | 27.0 | |
| Total | 204 | 100 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The strategies adopted by vam farmers for reduction of postharvest losses of vams in the 294 area included adoption of modern storage facilities. 45.1% (92) of the yam farmers 295 sometimes adopt modern storage facilities. 22.5% (46) oftentimes adopt modern storage 296 facility, whereas, 21.6% (44) maintained that they always used it. Only 10.8% (22) of the 297 yam farmers submitted that they do not use modern storage facilities at all. The result 298 implies that the adoption or continuous use of modern storage facilities is low in the area 299 as only 27% have adopted and hence use them consistently. This could be due to the 300 expensive and complex nature of the modern storage facilities. 301

The result shows that 34.8% (71) of the yam farmers in the study area oftentimes try to 302 link-up with buyers or otherwise sell at farm gate prices to avoid spoilage. This is an 303 indication that farmers are in need of market linkages. Linking farmers to potential 304 buyers or processors and consumers is a vital strategy of minimizing post-harvest losses 305 of yam. The regrettable consequence of adopting this measure is that, yam farming 306 307 households turn to incur economic loss, as they do not always get the benefit of the full value of the yams they produce. This situation was captured in the opinion of a group 308 discussant from Tswarev in Logo Local Government Area that: 309

"For me, I am happy that my yams stay in the ground till 310 maturity, but I cannot take the risk to store them because I 311 don't know the next thing that will happen, whether Fulani 312 will attack or something else and because of the many 313 money problems, I just sell the yams once I harvest them at 314 the farm. Although it is painful to me because I know that 315 these middlemen will end up benefiting more than me on 316 these yams, but do I have another choice?" 317 The implication is that many of the farmers adopt sell at farm-gate as a measure to reduce 318

postharvest losses of yams, despite their awareness of the possible postharvest losses

involved in terms of economic losses, which may have adverse implication of adoptingsuch strategy for the standard of living of their households.

The result revealed that majority of yam farmers in the study area applies curing method, 322 fungicide, and pesticide as a strategy to reduce postharvest loss of yams. This may also 323 explain the low level of losses of yams in the study area. The use of pesticides controls 324 attack by pests like rodents, especially in storage facilities or structures such as the barn, 325 which has no anti-rodent guard fitted to it as it is with the case of elevated shade store. 326 Given that one of the main structural problem with the yam barn storage method is that, 327 disease causing fungi and pest can easily attack stored vams, it becomes reasonable and 328 safe to conclude that the prominent use of yam barn method for yam storage in North-329 East Zone of Benue State warrants the application of fungicide and pesticide as a measure 330 for the reduction of postharvest losses of yams. 331

332 Test of Hypothesis

The result of the ordinary least square multiple regression analysis used to test the hypothesis that, pest attack, storage method, temperature, disease and infections, long distance, poor transportation facility, theft, poor handling, sprouting, destruction from crises, underdeveloped market and excessive exposure of yam to sunlight are not factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State is presented in table 4 below.

339

| Benue State | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Variables | Linear | Exponential | Semi-log+ | Double-log |
| Constant | 29.687 | 1.557 | 0.784 | 1.636 |
| | (2.047)** | (13.263)*** | (1.995)** | (12.257)*** |
| Pest Attack | -0.744 | -0.010 | -11.331 | -0.144 |
| | (-2447)* | (-0.817) | (5.835)*** | (-1.320) |
| Poor Storage | -1.602 | 0.021 | -0.861 | 0.265 |
| C C | (4.553)*** | (1.941)** | (2.174)** | (2.968)*** |
| Temperature of the Area | -3.576 | 0.006 | 1.916 | -0.046 |
| - | (3.114)*** | (0.600) | (2.444)** | (-0.457) |
| Diseases and Infections | 2.797 | 0.016 | -0.257 | 0.059 |
| | (1.142) | (0.826) | (3.096)*** | (0.448) |
| Long Distance | -0.560 | -0.009 | -0.787 | -0.039 |
| - | (-0.379) | (-0.719) | (-0.060) | (-0.378) |
| Poor Transportation facility | 2.355 | 0.040 | 29.962 | -0.397 |
| | (1.184) | (2.492)** | (2.300)*** | (3.881)*** |
| Theft of Yam | -4.119 | -0.039 | -23.210 | -0.224 |
| | (-3.476)*** | (-4.051)*** | (2.206)** | (-2.708)* |
| Poor Handling of Yam | -0.177 | -0.004 | -2.859 | -0.087 |
| _ | (-0.418) | (-1.089) | (8.716)*** | (-1.184) |
| Sprouting | -0.280 | -0.003 | -11.289 | -0.163 |
| | (-0.854) | (-1.180) | (-1.340) | (-2.472)*** |
| Destruction from Crises | -0.111 | -0.001 | -5.018 | -0.020 |
| | (-0.854) | (-0.519) | (-0.937) | (-0.485) |
| Underdeveloped Market | 0.143 | -0.001 | -0.738 | -0.058 |
| - | (0.245) | (-0.203) | (-0.076) | (-0.757) |
| Excessive exposure of yam to | 0.099 | -0.001 | 3.892 | 0.040 |
| sunlight | (-0.283) | (-0.343) | (5.317)*** | (0.583) |
| \mathbb{R}^2 | 0.462 | 0.789 | 0.808 | 0.563 |
| Adj. R ² | 0.441 | 0.771 | 0.792 | 0.557 |
| F-ratio | (2.702)*** | (14.016)*** | (28.122)*** | (4.638)*** |

Table 4: Factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State

343 Source: Field Survey, 2018.

NB: ***, ** and * represents 1%, 5% and 10% level of statistical significance respectively. Figure in brackets are t-values, whereas, the affirmative symbol + represents lead equation.

346

Based on the magnitude of the coefficient of multiple determination (\mathbb{R}^2), the number of significant variables, the signs of the regression of the entire model as indicated by the Fstatistic, the Semi-log model was selected as the lead model. The value of the coefficient of multiple determinant (\mathbb{R}^2) is 0.808, which implies that about 80.8% of the postharvest losses of yam in the study area is explained by the explanatory variables included in the model. The F-statistic of the lead equation is significant at 1% (28.122), which implies that the model was well specified. Thus pest attack, storage method used, temperature of

³⁴⁴ 345

the study area, disease and infections, poor transportation facility, theft of yam, poor harvesting method and excessive exposure of yam to sunlight were observed to be the significant variables precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State.

Coefficients of pest attack (5.835), disease and infections of yam (3.096), poor transportation facility (2.300), poor handling method used (8.716), excessive exposure of yam to sunlight (5.317); were positively related to postharvest losses of yam in the study area at 1% level of significant. This implies an increase in these variables would lead to increase in postharvest losses of yam in the study area.

The coefficient of storage method used in the area (2.174), temperature of the area (2.444) and coefficient of theft of yam (2.206) in the study area were positive and significant to postharvest losses of yam at 5% level of significant. This implies a direct relationship of the variables with postharvest losses of yam in the study area. Therefore, increase in any of the variables would lead to increase in postharvest losses of yam in the study area.

Given that, the computed F- value (28.122), was significantly higher than the tabulated Fvalue (9.33), at 1% level of significance, and (3.11) at 5% level of significance; the null hypothesis was therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis that; pest attack, storage method, temperature, disease and infections, poor transportation facility, theft, poor handling of yams, excessive exposure of yam to sunlight; are factors precipitating postharvest losses of yam in North-East Zone of Benue State was accepted.

375 Conclusion/Recommendation

The study thus concludes that, pest attack, storage method used, temperature, disease and 376 infections, poor transportation facility, theft of yams, poor handling of yams and 377 excessive exposure of yams to sunlight are the factors precipitating postharvest losses of 378 yams in the study area. The study recommends yam flour processing factory in the study 379 area, which will provide a ready yam market that will reduce postharvest losses of yams 380 and also increase the economic value of yams, both government and private investors 381 should take a business opportunity by building yam flour processing factory(s) in the 382 study area. 383

384 **Refernces**

Abu, G.A. and Soom, A. (2016). Analysis of factors affecting food security in rural and 385 urban farming households of Benue State, Nigeria. International journal of food 386 and Agricultural economics 4(1) pp. 55-68. 387 Adamu, I.G., Mada, D.A. and Kabri, H.U. (2014). Comparison of yam storage techniques 388 to reduce postharvest losses with regard to effective storage structures in Ganye 389 Local Government, Adamawa State, Nigeria. IOSR Journal of Engineering. 4(8), 390 pp 26-31. 391 392 Ahmed, R. and Rustagi, N. (1987). Marketing and price incentives in Africa and Asian countries. In Elz, D. (ed), Agricultural Marketing Strategy and Pricing Policy. 393 Washington: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.FAO 394 (1998)395 FAO (2000). The state of food and agriculture: Conflicts, agriculture and food security. 396 Retrieved from www.FoodSecurityPortalon 15/01/2018. 397 FAO (2018). Save food: Global initiative on food loss and waste reduction. Key facts on 398 399 food loss and waste you should know. Retrieved from www.fao.org on 28 February, 2018. 400 401 FAO (1998).Storage and processing of roots and tubers in the tropics. Edited by D.J.B 402 Calverley, Retrieved from www.fao.orgon 20/12/2016. 403

| 404 405 | Gernah, D.I., Ukeyima, M.T., Ikya, J.K., Ode, F.K. and Ogunbande, B.J. (2013). Addressing food security challenges through agro-raw materials |
|------------|---|
| 406 | processing. Agricultural Science Research Journal. 3(1), pp 6-13. |
| 407 | Ivanda D.P. Ighokwa F.M. Olatunii O.M. (2015) Assassment of food sacurity situation |
| 409 | of Tiv farming households in Nigeria.Journal of Agricultural Extension.19(1). |
| 410 | Kiaya, V. (2014).Postharvest losses and strategies to reduce them. A technical paper |
| 411 | published by ACF International. |
| 412 | Kitingia I and Community (1000) Deathermost to built on for anylling to such |
| 413 | Kitinoja, L. and Gorny, J.R. (1999). Postnarvest technology for small-scale produce |
| 414 415 | Postharvest Host.Series No.21. |
| 416 | Ministry of Fisheries, Crops and Livestock, New Guyana Marketing Corporation and |
| 417 | National Agricultural Research Institute (2014). Yam: postharvest care and |
| 418 | market preparation. Postharvest handling technical bulletin No.32.Retrieved from |
| 419 | www.pdf.usaid.gov on 19/7/2017 |
| 420 | Nwafor S.C., Wegh F.S., Ikwuba A.A., and Adegbola A.J. (2019). Effect of Marketing |
| 421 | Extension Services on the Control of Post-harvest Losses of Root and Tuber Crop |
| 422 | Producein Abia State, Nigeria. Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, |
| 423 | Economics and Extension 29(3) 1-12 |
| 424 | Opera, L.U. (2003). Yams: postharvest operation INPHO postharvest compendium. |
| 425 | Retrieved from <u>www.fao.org</u> on 20 th January 2017. |
| 426 | Osunde, Z.D. (2008). Minimizing postharvest losses in yam (dioscorea spp): treatments |
| 427 | and techniques, in Robertson, G.L. & Lupien, J.R. (eds). Using food science and |
| 428 | technology to improve nutrition and promote national development. International |
| 429 | Union of Food Science & Technology. |
| 430 | Phillips, D., Ogbonna, M., Etudaiye, H., Mignouna, D. and Siwoko, B. (2013). Yam |
| 431 | improvement for income and food security in West Africa. Nigeria: Detailed yam |
| 432 | value chain analysis. Retrieved from <u>www.iita.org</u> on 20 January, 2017 |
| 433 | |
| 434 | Sanginga, N. and IITA (2015). Root and tuber crops (cassava, yam, potato and sweet |
| 435 | potato).Feeding Africa: an action plan for African agricultural |
| 436 | transformation. Abdou Diouf International Conference Center, Daltar, Senegal. |
| 437 | |
| 438 | Silas, D. (2018: January 18). Herdsmen burn ex-naval chief's farm, destroy crops worth |
| 439 | over N200 million in Kwara. Retrieved from <u>www.dailypost.ng</u> on 25/01/2018. |

- 440 Verter, N. and Becvarova, V. (2014). Yam production as pillar of food security in Logo
 441 *local government area of Benue state, Nigeria*. European Scientific
 442 Journal.10(31). Pp. 27-42.
- Yam Farmers Association (2018).Logo, Ukum and Katsina Ala Branchs.Unpublished
 names of registered members of yam farmers association.