Cassava Innovation Application among Small Scale Farmers in North Central Nigeria: A Panacea for Farmers Livelihood Status

¹Ibrahim, M., ¹Salihu, I.T. ¹Umar, I.S., and ²Makusidi, H. M ¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. Federal University of Technology, Minna ³Department of Agricultural Education Federal Capital Territory College of Education, Zuba-Abuja E mail address: gausubrahama@yahoo.com or m. ibrahim@futminna.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

The study assess cassava innovation adoption among small scale farmers in North Central Nigeria. Specific objectives are to; describe socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, examines sources of information, determine level of cassava innovation adoption, and to identify the constraining factors affecting cassava innovation adoption in the study area. A multistage sampling techniques was used to select 750 cassava farmers. Primary data were collected with validated questionnaires having reliability coefficient of r=0.87. Descriptive statistics, adoption scale and factor analysis were employed for data counts. The results revealed that, the mean age was 35.5 years, 60.0% and 96.0% were male and married. 57% had secondary education, 73.3% were members of cooperative. 96.0% and 73.3% of the respondents operates less than two hectares and had annual income from N-151,000- N-200, 000 respectively. Majority (73.3%) acquired their land through inheritance. 80% had no extension contact. Major source of information was radio. Among innovations adopted were improved cassava variety (TME419) with adoption score of 78.7% which ranked 1st and the use of pickup van for transportation with adoption score of 77.3% which rank 2nd. In adequate extension service and poor extension contact were the major constraints to cassava innovations adoption with the mean values of (x = 4.69) and (x = 4.67) respectively. It was recommended that, there should be adequate and quality extension contact to acquaint cassava farmers with technical information to increase productivity and improve their livelihood status. Key words: Cassava, Innovation, and Livelihood status

INTRODUCTION

Cassava (*Manihot esculenta*) is an important staple food and cash crop in several tropical African countries especially Nigeria where it plays a principal role in the food economy. Nigeria is the largest cassava producing country in the world with an annual estimate of 39 million tonnes (Central Bank of Nigeria, 2003). Nigeria's production accounts for 19% of the world output and 34% of Africa's output (Okoro *et al.*, 2005). Among the starchy staples, cassava gives a carbohydrate production which is about 40% higher than rice and 25% more than maize, with the result that cassava is the cheapest source of calories for both human nutrition and animal feeding (Tonukari, 2004). In Nigeria, the most common forms being `garri`, `fufu`, tapioca, composite flour, vegetable alcohol, starch and its pellets for livestock feed (IITA 1993, 1994). Nigerian cassava average yield of 7-12 metric tonnes per hectare is still lower compare to high yield of 25-40 metric tons/ha obtained in Thailand and Brazil and also lower than the world average yield of 10.76 tonnes per hectare irrespective of her being ranked highest cassava producer in the world. The main solution to this problem is adoption of improved cassava varieties and production technologies by the farmers (Imo, 2006).

The high consumption of cassava in the country led to an increase in the demand for this crop both for food and for industrial uses, which exceeded the supply (Odigboh, 1985). To reverse

this trend, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) and National Roots Crop Research Institute (NRCRI) in Nigeria led the development of improved cassava cultivars through their breeding programmes to obtain higher quality cassava stems at relatively shorter time and pest/disease resistant cassava cultivars capable of adapting to a wide range of ecological conditions and farming systems. These cultivars include TMS 30572, TMS 30555, TMS 4(2)1425, NR 8082, TEM419 and NR 8203. These have been tried and found to be high yielding as well as disease and pest resistant. Consequently, they have been distributed through the public extension service (Agricultural Development Programme) and adopted in varying degrees in different ecological zones of Nigeria. However, the first step in assessing the usefulness of the technology to cassava farmers is to determine the attributes responsible for choice of cultivars among the farmers as well as the major constraints militating against the effective use of these cultivars. Dorp and Rulkens (1993), Agwu (2002), Springer et al. (2002) and Kimenju et al. (2005) show that farmers decision to use particular crop cultivars were influenced by a number of reasons, some of which are market driven or socio-culturally based. Therefore, it is against this background that this study seeks to determine the level cassava innovation adoption among small scale farmers Kogi State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to: describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents; examine the source of awareness of cassava varieties in the study area; examine the level of cassava innovation adoption and identifies major constraining factors to cassava innovation adoption among small scale farmers in the study area.

Methodology

Kogi State fells within Guinea Savannah ecological zone of Nigeria geographically located at Latitude 7° 47'N and Longitudes 6° 44'E and have the temperature of 22^{0} C to 31^{0} C. Annual rainfall of 1100mm-1600mm, they engage in farming and fishing well known for the cultivation of crops such as; cassava, yam, cashew, maize, groundnut, melon and rice. Seven hundred and fifty (750) respondents were sampled for the study from established sample frame of 7,500 famers. A validated questionnaire with Cronbach's Alpha reliability co-efficient of (r=87) was used to elicit data in October 2018 of which age and educational attainment were measured in years, while cooperative membership and sex were measured using binary and household size was measured in number. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics, adoption scale analysis and factor analysis. The study was limited to only Kogi State in the North Central of Nigeria.

Results and Discussion

Socio-Economics Characteristics of the Respondents

From Table 1, the result revealed that more than half (53.3%) of the respondents fell within the age ranges of 31- 40 years which means that bulk of the respondents are within the active age. The likely implication is that the majority of the respondents are expected to participate in adoption of improved cassava varieties technologies as they are agile and physically disposed to pursue economic activity for poverty reduction while only 2.7% were above 50 years of age. The mean age was 35.5 years. Cassava production in the study area is male dominated venture (60%). This may be attributed to the tedious nature of agricultural activities which many women cannot cope with. Nevertheless, in all most the communities sampled, women still played a very vital role in cassava production, especially in the areas of planting, harvesting, transporting and processing of the cassava produce. Study revealed that family labour formed a significant proportion of the total labour used on farm thereby enabling the cultivation of large hectares of land and reducing the cost of bring labour for farm operations. Majority (82.7%) of the respondents had household size between the ranges of 1-10 persons.

Majority (73.3%) were member of one cooperative or the others. This agrees with Chikezie *et al.* (2012) who stated that cooperative groups are organized for the promotion of special interest or to meet certain needs that can rarely be achieved by the individual efforts. Ojukaiye (2001), classification of farm size of 0.1hectare to 5.9hectares as small farms, this implies that majority subsistence farming are small-holder farmers, which means that their production will be limited to household consumption with little left for sale and this will not give room for investment on the farm as the respondents may have fragmented farmland used for cassava production. Majority (96.0%) of the respondents operate less than two hectare of land. This is in line with findings of Chikezie *et al.* (2012) who found that one major characteristic of small-scale farmers is fragmented land holdings.

The study reveals that about 77.3% of the respondents had farming experience of up to 20 years. This implies that cassava farming is not new to the farmers due the number of years they have been involved in farming the produce and are expected to be able to make better decisions as regards adoption, resource allocation and management of their cassava farms. This findings corroborate with Chikezie (2012) who opined that experience is gained with age and as age increases among farmers, their years of experience also increases. Education is an important socio-economic factor that influences the behaviour of people in general. It can play a significant role in determining farmers' acceptance and adoption of new and improved farm technologies. Majority (80%) of the respondents were literate and could easily adopt an improved technology. The findings agrees with Okoye, Okorji and Asumugha (2004), who opined that educated farmers are expected to be more receptive to improved farming techniques. Land is definitely the most important natural and production resource for agricultural purposes and it is often given a wide economic definition to include all materials and forces that are supplied by nature for use in the production of goods and services. Depending on the land tenure system available in any given area, there are several ways of acquiring land. Majority (73.3%) of the respondents acquired their land through inheritance, only few (6.7%) purchases the land for farming cassava.

Table 1: Socio-Economics Characteristics of Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21-30	100	13.3

1-50 230 30.7 >50 20 2.7 Mean = 35.5	31-40	400	53.3
>50 20 2.7 Merial Status			
Mean = 35.5 Image: Married Status Image: Married Status Single 30 4.0 Married 720 96.0 Gender Image: Married Status 96.0 Gender Image: Married Status 96.0 Gender Image: Married Status 96.0 Female 300 40.0 Extension Contact 600 80.0 Household size Image: Married Status Image: Married Status 1-5 200 26.7 6-10 420 56.0 >10 130 17.3 Mean = 5 Image: Cooperative Membership Image: Married Status Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) Image: Married Status Image: Married Status Farming Experience Image: Married Status Image: Married Status Frimary 70 22.7 24.0 Adult Education 80 10.7 Anual Income Image: Married Status Image: Mar			
Marital Status			
Single 30 4.0 Married 720 96.0 Gender			
Married 720 96.0 Gender		30	4.0
Gender Image 450 60.0 Male 450 60.0 Female 300 40.0 Extension Contact 00 20.0 No Contact 600 80.0 Household size			
Male 450 60.0 Female 300 40.0 Extension Contact			
Female 300 40.0 Extension Contact		450	60.0
Extension Contact Image: Second			
Contacted 150 20.0 No Contact 600 80.0 Household size			
No Contact 600 80.0 Household size 200 26.7 $6-10$ 420 56.0 >10 130 17.3 Mean = 5 73.3 73.3 Cooperative Membership $$		150	20.0
Household size20026.7 $1-5$ 20056.0>1013017.3Mean = 573.3Cooperative Membership73.3Member20026.7Farm Size (Ha)100000< 1 Ha	No Contact		
1-5 200 26.7 $6-10$ 420 56.0 > 10 130 17.3 $Mean = 5$ Cooperative Membership Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) < 1 Ha 120 16.0 $1-2$ Ha 600 80.0 >2 Ha 30 4.0 Farming Experience $1-10$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Ideuation 80 10.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 $100,000-150,000$ 550 73.3			
6-10 420 56.0 >10 130 17.3 Mean = 5 73.3 Cooperative Membership 73.3 Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) 7 7 < 1 Ha		200	26.7
>10 130 17.3 Mean = 5	6-10	420	56.0
Cooperative Membership 73.3 Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) $ < 1$ Ha 120 16.0 $1-2$ Ha 600 80.0 >2 Ha 30 4.0 Farming Experience $ 1-10$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status $-$ Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $ 100,000-150,000$ 150 20.0 550 73.3 $>$ $>200,000$ 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition $ -$ Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase </td <td>>10</td> <td></td> <td></td>	>10		
Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) 600 80.0 < 1 Ha 120 16.0 $1-2$ Ha 600 80.0 >2 Ha 30 4.0 Farming Experience 1 $1-10$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 170 22.7 Educational Status 9.3 Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $100,000-150,000$ 150 $150,002,000$ 550 73.3 $>200,000$ 550 73.3 $>200,000$ 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 10.7 Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	Mean = 5		
Member 550 73.3 No Member 200 26.7 Farm Size (Ha) 600 80.0 < 1 Ha 120 16.0 $1-2$ Ha 600 80.0 >2 Ha 30 4.0 Farming Experience 1 $1-10$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 170 22.7 Educational Status 9.3 Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $100,000-150,000$ 150 $150,002,000$ 550 73.3 $>200,000$ 550 73.3 $>200,000$ 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 10.7 Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	Cooperative Membership		
Farm Size (Ha) Image: scalar sca		550	73.3
<1 Ha	No Member	200	26.7
<1 Ha	Farm Size (Ha)		
>2 Ha 30 4.0 Farming Experience 1 1-10 years 130 17.3 11-20 years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 10.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 10.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 10.7 Annual Income 100,000-150,000 150 20.0 151,000-200,000 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 Inheritance 550 73.3 10.7 10		120	16.0
Farming Experience 130 17.3 1-10 years 130 17.3 11-20 years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status 9.3 Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income 100,000-150,000 150 151,000-200,000 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 80 10.7 Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	1-2 Ha	600	80.0
1-10 years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status $-$ Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $ 100,000-150,000$ 150 20.0 $151,000-200,000$ 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition $-$ Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	>2 Ha	30	4.0
1-10 years 130 17.3 $11-20$ years 450 60.0 >20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status $-$ Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $ 100,000-150,000$ 150 20.0 $151,000-200,000$ 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition $-$ Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	Farming Experience		
>20 years 170 22.7 Educational Status		130	17.3
Educational Status9.3Primary709.3Secondary43057.3Tertiary17022.7Adult Education8010.7Annual Income10.7100,000- 150,00015020.0151,000-200,00055073.3>200,000506.7Mode of Land Acquisition73.3Purchase506.7Gift8010.7Lease709.3	11-20 years	450	60.0
Primary 70 9.3 Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income $100,000-150,000$ 150 $100,000-150,000$ 150 20.0 $151,000-200,000$ 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 73.3 Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	>20 years	170	22.7
Secondary 430 57.3 Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income 20.0 100,000-150,000 150 20.0 151,000-200,000 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	Educational Status		
Tertiary 170 22.7 Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income 20.0 100,000-150,000 150 20.0 151,000-200,000 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3	Primary	70	9.3
Adult Education 80 10.7 Annual Income	Secondary	430	57.3
Annual Income20.0100,000-150,00015020.0151,000-200,00055073.3>200,000506.7Mode of Land Acquisition73.3Inheritance55073.3Purchase506.7Gift8010.7Lease709.3	Tertiary	170	22.7
100,000- 150,00015020.0151,000-200,00055073.3>200,000506.7Mode of Land Acquisition73.3Inheritance55073.3Purchase506.7Gift8010.7Lease709.3	Adult Education	80	10.7
151,000-200,000 550 73.3 >200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 73.3 Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3			
>200,000 50 6.7 Mode of Land Acquisition 73.3 Inheritance 550 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3		150	20.0
Mode of Land AcquisitionInheritance55073.3Purchase506.7Gift8010.7Lease709.3		550	73.3
Inheritance 550 73.3 Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3		50	6.7
Purchase 50 6.7 Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3			
Gift 80 10.7 Lease 70 9.3			
Lease 70 9.3			
	Gift		
		70	9.3

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Respondents Sources of Information

From table 2, it can be seen that majority (92.0%) of the respondents sourced information on improved cassava varieties from friends and neighbours; this implies that most of information were obtained from their fellow farmers. This finding is in line with Abamu (2006) who stated that in the stage of adoption of improved varieties, farmers were most likely to be influenced by such information sources like agricultural cooperatives, radio, and friends with neighbours. Only few 20% got their information from television, this may be attributed to the poor power supply

Sources of Information	Frequency*	Percentage
Radio	550	73.3
Television	150	20.0
Newspaper/ Bulletin	100	13.3
Extension Agent	400	53.3
Neighbour/ Friends	690	92.0

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents according to Information Sources

*Multiple responses

Sources: Field Survey, 2018

Respondents Levels of Cassava Innovation Adoption

Level of Cassava Innovation Adoption. Table 3 revealed that improved cassava varieties (TEM419), use of pickup van and storage of the cassava stem under the shade for 2-3 before cutting for planting rank first, second and third with adoption score of 78.7%, 77.3% and 70.0% respectively while cassava innovation that were rejected are; weeding at 4,8 and 12 weeks after planting; biological methods of weed control e.g fallowing, use of cover crops application of 8 bags of NPK 15:15:15: 4-8 weeks after planting and transportation using wheel barrow. The cassava innovation that farmers were not aware of are; recommended planting space of 1m by 0.8m; chemical methods of weeds control; mechanical harvester e.g lifter; motorised cassava harvester and storage.

Table 3: Level of Cassava Innovation Adoption n=750

List of Cassava innovations	NA	Α	Ι	E	Т	Α	D	AS (%)	Ran k
Good soil-better ridges	-	125	45	20	50	420*	-	56.0	7 th
Improves cassava varieties (TME419)	-	100	50	-	20	590*	-	78.7	1 st
Stem for planting should be 10-12 months old	-	150	130	50	40	400*	-	53.3	9 th
Stem should be store under the shade 2-5 days before being cut and planted	-	170	-	50	-	530*	-	70.0	3 rd
Stem should be cut with sharp tools preferably secateurs	-	170	20	20	20	520*		69.3	4 th
Stem cutting should be 25cm length with 5-7 nodes	200	150	-	-	-	400*	-	53.3	9 th
Planting should be horizontally inclined or vertically on the mould and one-third above the soil surface	-	120	70	60	80	420*	-	56.0	7 th
Buds pointed upwards	-	250	40	-	30	430*	-	57.3	5 th
Spacing 1m by 0.8m on crest of ridges will give 12,500 stand/ha	390*	200	60	50	-	50		52.0	
Weeding at 4, 8, 12 weeks after planting	-	200	190	-	40	20	400*	53.3	
Cultural method of weed control. eg hoeing, tillage and mulching	-	200	-	80	70	400*	-	53.3	9 th
Biological method eg fallowing and use of cover crops	30	250	100	-	-	-	370*	49.3	
Chemical methods e. g pre- planting; Atrazine+metolachor	-	200	80	60	20	390*	-	52.0	13 th
Chemical methods e.g post emergence Fusilade Forte 5-6 L/ha	450*	50	45	35	25	20	125	60.0	
Intercropped with legumes to sustained soil fertility	-	50	50	50	50	400*	150	53.3	9 th
8 bags of NPK 15:15;15 4-8 weeks after planting	-	250	-	-	-	120	380*	50.6	
Ring method of fertilization	-	95	85	75	70	425*	-	56.7	6 th

Mechanical Harvesting method; Cassava lifter	395*	100	95	60	50	50	-	52.7	
Motorized Cassava Harvester	450*	200	100	-	-	-	-	60.0	
Storage	480*	220	50	-	-	-	-	64.0	
Transportation using wheelbarrows	-	260	200	90	-	-	490*	65.3	
Transportation using Pickup van	-	120	40	-	-	580*	-	77.3	2 nd

Keys; NA= Not Aware; A=Awareness; I=Interest; E= Evaluation; T=Trial; A=Adoption

D=Discontinuance; AS= Adoption Scores as adopted by Adesope, 2012

Decision Rules; Adoption Scores \geq 50% = High Adoption *Levels of adopted practice by farmers

Ease of Cassava Innovation Adoption

Table 4 reveals that good soil-better ridges, improved cassava varieties, cutting cassava stem with sharp tools, bud pointed upward when planting, cultural method of weed control and ring methods of fertilizers application were the major innovations that were affordable and simple to adopt. Innovations that were very complex to adopt by the farmers were; length of the stem with numbers of nodes as farmers see it as time consuming, planting with specification of angle (horizontally and vertically incline), intercropped with legumes as farmers finding it difficult to know exactly leguminous cropped will be best intercropped with the cassava.

Innovations Adopted	Aims	Α	S	C	Α
Good soil-better ridges	To know the nutrients status of the soil- improve soil structure	X	X		
Improves cassava varieties (TME419)	Disease resistance and high yielding	Х	X		X
Stem for planting should be 10- 12 months old	Should be mature, healthy without stem and leaf damage from pest and disease		X		
Stem should be store under the shade 2-5 days before being cut and planted	To ease nodes innitiation		X		X
Stem should be cut with sharp tools preferably secateurs or cutlasses	Smooth surface cut enhanced establishment of plant in the field. Jagged cut destroyed the nodes	X	X		X
Stem cutting should be 25cm length with5-7 nodes	The higher the number of nodes the quicker the establishment			X	
Planting should be horizontally inclined or vertically on the mould and one-third above the soil surface	To make root initiation easy			X	
Buds pointed upwards	Upwards of the bud will increase the rate of photosynthesis	Х	X		
Cultural method of weed control. eg hoeing, tillage and mulching	To increase water infiltration	X	X		

Table 4: Ease of Cassava Innovation adoption by the respondents

Chemical methods e. g pre- planting; Atrazine+metolachor 4 L/ha	To make the farm land neater			X	
Intercropped with legumes to sustained soil fertility	To fix atmospheric nitrogen and reduces soil erosion		Х		Х
Ring method of fertilization	To evenly circulate nutrient at the base of the plant	Х	Х		
Transportation using Pickup van	To carry more quantity at a time			Х	

Keys; A= Affordable; S=Simplicity; C=Complexity; A= Accuracy

Sources; Field Survey, 2018

Factors Constraining Cassava Innovation Adoption. Data from table five shows that inadequate extension service, poor extension contact and high cost of cassava stem were the major constraining factors hindering the adoption of cassava innovation which 1st, 2nd and the third respectively with the mean values of 4.69, 4.67 and 4.65 and agein values of 0.67, 0.67 and 0.65

Constraining Factors	Mean	Varimax rotated component matrix					
		MF	IF1	CF1	IF2	CF2	Rank
Age of the farmers	3.0					0.50	27 th
High level hydrocyanic	4.2	0.80					10 th
Market problem	3.86	0.70					15 th
Pest and diseases	3.61	0.69					18 th
High cost of cassava stem	4.65	0.65					3 rd
Price fluctuation	4.54	0.62					6 th
Water problem	3.64		0.82				17 th
Poor road network	4.23		0.73				8 th
Flood and drought	3.25		0.70				21 th
Non-availability of agro- chemicals	3.19		0.65				22nd
Poor power supply	4.13		0.62				12 th
High transportation cost	4.19		0.59				11 th
Inadequate capital	4.40			0.68			7 th
Limited access to credit	3.49			0.57			19 th
Problem of land tenure system	3.72				0.74		16 th
Poor government policy	4.21				0.70		9 th
Research problem	3.47				0.68		20 th
Inadequate extension services	4.69				0.67		1 st
High labour cost	3.96				0.55		14 th
Storage facility problem	4.55				0.63		5 th
Predators	4.0				0.42		13 th
Low consumer preference	3.11					0.32	26 th
High risk and uncertainty	3.13	0.37					25 th
Lack of technical know how	3.19					0.38	22 nd
Shortage of planting materials	3.15	0.50					24th

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents according to Constraining Factors

Poor extension contact	4.67		0.67	2^{nd}
Complexity of technology	4.64		0.66	4th

Keys: MF= Market Factors; IF1=Infrastructural Factors; CF=Credits Factors; IF2= Institutional Factors; CF=Cultural Factors

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Authors Biography

The lead author was born in 1976 in Niger State Nigeria. He obtained first, second and third degrees in 2004, 2011 and 2016 respectively in Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. He joined the service of Federal University of Technology Minna, Niger State Nigeria since 2007. He is married with children.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It was concluded that majority of the respondents were male, married with mean household size of 5. Majority acquired their land through inheritance and had no extension contact. Radio was major source of information. Improved cassava variety (TME419) with adoption score of 78.7% ranked 1st. In adequate extension service and poor extension contact were the major constraints to cassava innovations adoption. It was recommended that, there should be adequate and quality extension contact to acquaint cassava farmers with technical information to increase productivity and improve their livelihood status.

REFERENCES

- Abamu, J. U. (2006), Essentials of Agricultural Commocialisation in Nigeria. Lagos: Malthouse press Limited.
- Adesope, O.M.; E.C. Mathews-Njoku; N.S. Oguzor and V.C. Ugwuja (2012): Effects of Socio-economic characteristics of farmers on their adoption of organic farming practices, crop production technologies. <u>www.intechopen.com/books/cropproduction-technologies/effect-of-socio-economic-characteristics-of-farmers-ontheir-adoption-of organic-farming-practices</u>. pp 211-219. Accessed 18th August, 2018.
- Agwu AE (2002). Cowpea varietal needs of farmers in Bauchi and Gombe states of Nigeria. Tropical Agric. Food, Environ. Ext. Volume 3 (1): Pp. 55- 62.
- Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2003): Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Reports and Statement of Accounts.
- Chikezie, U. P., Omokore, D.F., Akpoko, J. G and Chikakaire, J. (2012). Factors Influencing adoption of cassava production practice inOnu-Imo Local Government Area of Imo State. Nigeria. Greener Journal of Agricultural Science 2 (6): 259-268
- Dorp, M., Rulkens, T. (1993). Farmer crop selection criteria and gene bank collections in Indonesia, In: Boef W, Amanor K, Wellard K, Bebbington A (Eds). Cultivating knowledge: Genetic diversity, farmer experimentation and crop research. London, intermediate technology publications. Pp. 119-127.
- Imo, V.O. (2006). Cassava production in Nigeria. Barloz Publishers Inc. Owerri Nigeria, Pp1-102.
- International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) (1993). Archival Report, 1988-1993 part 1: Cassava Breeding Cytogenetics and Histology, Volume 2: Germplasm Enhancement. Root and Tuber Improvement Program, Crop Improvement Division, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan.
- International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) (1994). *IITA in the news* July December pp: 47.
- Kimenju SC, De Groote H, Karugia J, Mbogoh S, Poland D (2005) Consumer awareness and attitudes toward GM foods in Kenya. Afr. J. Biotechnol. 4 (10): 1066-1075.
- Odigboh, E.U. (1985). Mechanisation of cassava production and processing. A decade of design and development. An Inaugural Lecture, University of Nigeria Nsukka. No. 8. UNN Press. Pp. 28
- OjuKaiye, E. O. (2001). Economics Analysis of Cassava Production in three Local Government Area OF Kogi State. Msc. Thesis. Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria.

- Okoro, E.; Lemchi, J.; Ezedinma, C.; Dixon, A.; Akoroda, M.; Sanni, L.; Okechukwu, R.; Marco, P.; Nkumbira, J.; Ogbe, F.; Illona, P.; Tarawali, G. (2005). Technological Challenges of Cassava Commercialization and Industrialization in Nigeria. Guest Paper Presented at the 2005 African Technology Day Organized by the African Institute of Applied Economics (AIAE) and the African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS).
- Okoye, C. U. and Uzor, O. (2004). Globalization of Women intensity and household well-being in Nigeria. In Trde Aakin Aina, Chanchage Sethy L. Chanchage and Elizabeth Anna-Yao (eds) Globalization and Social Policy in African, Dakar, CODES R17 pp 339.
- Springer A, Mattas K, Papastefanou GT, Tsioumanis A (2002) Comparing Consumer Attitudes towards Genetically Modified Food in Europe. Mimeo.
- Tonukari NJ (2004). Cassava and the Future of Starch. *Electronic Journal of Biotechnology*. Vol. 7 No.1, Issue of April 15, 2004.