NIGERIAN AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL
ISSN: 0300-368X
Volume 55 Number 1, April 2024 Pg. 66-73
Available online at: http://www.ajol.info/index.php/naj
https://www.naj.asn.org.ng

Determinants of Farmers' Utilization of Post-Harvest Management Practices in Rice-Producing Areas of Abia State, Nigeria

[*1]Nwaobiala, C. U., [2]Azubuike, O. C. and [1]Godwin, H. O.

[1]Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development; [2]Department of Home Science
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria
[*]Corresponding authors' email: cunwaobiala@gmail.com

Abstract

The socio-economic determinants of farmers' utilization of post-harvest management practices in rice producing areas (Ikwuano and Unuahia North Local Government Areas) of Abia State, Nigeria was studied and analysed in 2023. The study adopted a multistage random sampling procedure to select 90 rice farmers for the study. Data for the study were collected with the aid of a structured questionnaire and analysed using both descriptive and multiple regression analysis. Result revealed that 72.22% of the rice farmers were males, 62.22% acquired secondary education having a mean household size is 6 persons with mean annual farm income of ₦853, 978.00 and annual non-farm income (₦515, 224) as against 5,33 years membership of social organization. Result showed that farmers had high utilization and constraints to rice post-harvest management practices, with mean scores of 2.7. Multiple regression result showed that the coefficients for sex (β=0.0157), education (β=0.0126), social organization (β=0.0173) and farm income (β=0.0165) were determinants of utilization of post-harvest management practices by farmers. The study concluded that farmers had high utilization of post-harvest management practices. The study recommended that rice farmers should belong to cooperative groups, engage in literacy and training programmes in order to benefit from the use of appropriate post-harvest management practices involved in rice production in the study area.

Keywords: ***Utilization, post-harvest, management, practices, rice farmers***

Introduction

In developing countries, more than 30% of the food produced for human consumption in Sub-Saharan Africa is being lost because of inadequate postharvest management (Musa-Gambo, 2020). Cultivation of rice in all the agro-ecological zones in Nigeria is relatively carried out by small scale farmers (Ubeh *et al*., 2020). Studies revealed that as the consumption level of rice increases, it directly affects production because of post-harvest losses experienced by farmers during harvesting, which has resulted to the need to develop post-harvest and value chain sectors in the country to reduce these losses incurred during the production process (National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS) 2022; Nwaobiala and Ubeh, 2020; Oyaniran, 2022).

West African Rice Development Association (2021) asserted that lack of storage and agro-processing facilities pose great impediments to Nigeria's rice value chain, which is a major staple food and mostly cultivated crop and sustains the livelihoods of millions of people thereby resulting to a chain of losses and huge wastage. Rice post-harvest losses are largely caused by field insect pests, fungal and bacterial diseases, poor management practices and unavailability of storage facilities and mechanical damage during harvesting.

Egwuonwu, (2020) in his study attributed proper post-harvest management system as a means of reducing the quantity and quality of rice losses which leads to higher income and food security of the farmer. Post-harvest operations in rice are regarded as the stage involving production by which harvesting follows when the panicle is separated from the rice plant at harvest, which is considered as the starting point of post-harvest management process. This process are divided into two groups namely technical activities (harvesting, field drying, threshing, cleaning, additional drying, storage, processing) and economic activities (transporting, marketing, quality control, information and communication, administration and management) (Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), 2021). Moreover, it has been reported that the Federal

Government of Nigeria total cost of post-harvest losses have risen to over $3.5 trillion annually which translate to be about 50 percent of the foods produced, which has resulted to negative effect on agricultural Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMA&RD), 2022).

The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (2023), reported that the causes of food losses especially rice in developing countries may not be unconnected with; inadequate extension services that is required to train farmers in handling and application of recommended storage technologies of rice and poor market access. In view of the above assertion, it seems there is paucity of information on the socio-economic factors of farmers that determine their utilization of rice post-harvest management practices in the area of study.

This necessitated the researchers to undertake the study to analyse socio-economic determinants of utilization of post-harvest management practices among farmers in rice producing areas (Ikwuano and Umuahia North Local Government Areas) of Abia State, Nigeria.

Specific objectives of this paper were to;

i.Describe socioeconomic characteristics of farmers;

ii. Ascertain levels of farmers' utilization of rice post-harvest management practices; and

iii. Examine constraints to farmers' utilization of rice post-harvest management practices in the study area.

Hypothesis tested;

$H0_1$: Rice farmers socio-economic factors such as; age, education, marital status, household size, farming experience, farm income, access to credit and cooperative membership do not determine their utilization of post-harvest management practices in the study area

Methodology

Study Area

The study was conducted in the rice-producing areas of Abia State, Nigeria. The Local Government are; Ikwuano Local Government and Umuahia North Local Government Areas.

Description of Ikwuano Local Government Area

Ikwuano Local Government Area is located in Abia State, Southeast Nigeria which was created on the 27th day of August 1991 from the defunct Ikwuano/Umuahia Local Government Area. The Local Government (LGA) has its headquarters in the town of Isiala Oboro and is bordered by Umuahia North 5° 24'N and by parts of Akwa Ibom State. Towns and Usaka villages that make up Ikwuano 5° 24'N include; Omuegwu, Afaranta, Nkwoachara, Ameke, Ariam, Uba- kala, Oloko, Oboro and Ibere. The Local Government Area lies between the Latitudes 5° 24'N and 5° 30'N and between the Longitudes of 5° 32'N of the Equator and 5° 37'N of the Greenwich meridian. The LGA has borders with Umuahia North and Bende to the North, Umuahia South and Isiala-Ngwa North to its West, Ini to the East and Obot-Akara to the South. The Federal Republic of Nigeria reports that the projected population growth of Ikwuano at 2.6% from 2006 population figure is 55,405 people (National Population Commission (NPC), 2022). Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike and National Root Crops Research Institute Umudike are the notable landmarks. The LGA occupies a total area of 281 square meters with an average temperature of 28°C (National Root Crops Research Institute (NRCRI), (2021).

Description of Umuahia North Local Government Area

Umuahia North is a Local Government Area of Abia State, Nigeria. Its headquarters are in the city of Umuahia. The Local Government Area is made up of Umuahia- Ibeku, Umukabia, Umuawa Alaocha, Umuagu, Umuda Isngwu and Ohuhu. The Federal Republic of Nigeria, projected population growth of the LGA at 2.6% from 2006 population figure totaling 10, 3157 people (National Population Commission (NPC), 2020). The Local Government Area lies between Latitude 5°31' 29.68" N of the Equator and Longitude 7° 29' 40.60''E of the Greenwich Meridian. The temperature varies from 18.9°C to 30.5°C and is rarely before 15°C above 32.2°C. The climate is classified as tropical. During most months of the year, there is significant rainfall and typically receives about 273.49 mm of precipitation and has 263.53 rainy days (72.2 percent of the time) annually, with Relative Humidity of 75.46 percent (NRCRI, 2023)

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Ikwuano and Umuahia North Local Government Areas were selected out of the four (4) rice producing areas of the State. Multistage random sampling procedure was used in the selection of three (3) circles each from the five (5) circles that make up the two (2) LGAs namely; Ikwuano: - Oro Ibere, Ugwu Ibere and Agbor Ibere: Umuahia North: – Ofeme, Erote-Isieke and Ubani Ibeku were randomly selected that gave a total of eighteen (18) circles. Simple random sampling procedure was employed in the selection of five (5) rice farmers from the selected circles to give a grand total of ninety (90) rice farmers. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts, percentages and mean scores and multiple regression analysis were adopted in the data analysis.

Measurement of variables

I. The levels of utilization of rice post-harvest management practices were measured and rated on a 3-point type rating scale of; always=3, occasionally = 2 and never = 1. Based on the thirteen (13) rice post-harvest management practices, The scores derived were computed for each of the practices by summing the weights of 3+2+1 = 6/3=2.0. The following decision rules were obtained thus: Mean scores between; 1.00–1.50 =low, 1.51–1.99 =moderate, 2.0 and above is high utilization of these practices.

ii. Constraints encountered during the utilization of rice post-harvest management practices by farmers were measured and rated on a 3- point Likert rating scale, categorized as; Severe = 3, mild = 2 and not severe =1. The seven (7) constraints statements response scores on rice post-harvest management practices available to the farmers were computed for each practice by adding the ratings of 3+2+1 which was divided by 6/3 to give 2.0. The following decision rules were adopted. Mean scores were categorized thus; 1.0 -1.49 = low constraint, 1.50 - 1.99 = moderate constraint; and above 2.0= high constraint.

Model specification

The hypothesis for the study was tested using multiple regression analysis at 95% confidence level. The four functional forms of regression model were explicitly stated thus: linear, semi-log, exponential and Cobb-Douglas were tried. The best fit was chosen as the lead equation based on its conformity with econometric and statistical criteria such as the magnitude of R^2, F-ratio and number of significant variables.

The four functional forms are expressed as follows:

i. Linear Function: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{12} + ei$

ii. Semi-log Function: $Y = L_n \beta_0 + \beta_1 L_n X_1 + \beta_2 L_n X_2 + \beta_3 L_n X_3 + \beta_4 L_n X_4 + \beta_5 L_n X_5 + \beta_6 L_n X_6 + \beta_7 L_n X_7 + \beta_8 L_n X_8 + \beta_9 L_n X_9 + \beta_{10} L_n X_{10} + \beta_{11} L_n X_{11} + X_{12} + ei$

iii. Exponential Function: $L_n Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{12} + ei$

iv. Exponential Function: $L_n Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{12} + ei$

v. Cobb-Douglas Function: $L_n Y = L_n \beta_0 + \beta_1 L_n X_1 + \beta_2 L_n X_2 + \beta_3 L_n X_3 + \beta_4 L_n X_4 + \beta_5 L_n X_5 + \beta_6 L_n X_6 + \beta_7 L_n X_7 + \beta_8 L_n X_8 + \beta_9 L_n X_9 + \beta_{10} L_n X_{10} + \beta_{11} L_n X_{11} + X_{12} + ei$

Where;

Y = utilization of post-harvest management practices measured by mean scores

X_1 = sex (male – 1, female=0)

X_2 =age of respondents (years)

X_3 = marital status (married =1, otherwise = 0)

X_4= household size (number of people in household)

X_5 = education level (years spent in school)

X_6= farming experience (years)

X_7 = farm size (hectares)

X_8= occupational status (farming= 1, otherwise = 0)

X_9= farm income (N)

X_{10}= non - farm income (N)

X_{10}= access to credit (access = 1, otherwise = 0)

X_{11}= membership of social organizations (numbers)

X_{12}= extension contact (numbers)

ei= error term

Results and Discussion

Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Rice Farmers

Table 1 showed the selected socio-economic characteristics of rice farmers in the study area. Result indicates that majority (72.22%) of the rice farmers were males. The results suggest that male farmers were involved in rice post-harvest management practices than their female counterparts. This result corroborates with the findings of Agada and Ijih, (2019) as they reported that male rice farmers utilized rice post-harvest technologies more than their female counterparts in Benue State, Nigeria. The mean household size is 6 persons. The result imply that majority of rice farmers involved in rice post-harvest management practices have medium household, which could contribute to labour availability during rice post-harvest practices. This supports the findings of Agro Nigeria, (2019), as they reported that farm families which fell within the range of 6 to 10 persons could reduce the drudgery involved in rice production activities and lower the rate of losses encountered during harvest. However, most (62.22%) of them acquired secondary education, which suggests that rice farmers were literate to understanding, accepting and utilizing rice post-harvest management practices. Amir, (2017) reported that educated farmers and households are better advantaged to engage in recommended rice post-harvest management practices that are productive. The mean annual farm income of rice farmers was ₦853, 978.00 and non-farm income of rice farmers was ₦515, 224. Coker and Ninalowo (2018) postulated that income realized from any rice enterprise is dependent on the post-harvest management practices adopted by the farmers. The result suggest that trading, civil service and processing which are non-farming sources has proven to augment farmers' family needs as reported by International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (2023). The mean years of social organization membership was 5.33years. Nwaobiala *et al*., (2023), Olatinwo *et al*., (2019) asserted that farmers' cooperatives enhances advantages of economics of scale, management of available resources for access to the best information on post-harvest management practices.

Level of Farmers' Utilization of Rice Post-Harvest Management Practices

Table 2 shows the mean frequency distribution of utilization rice post-harvest management practices among farmers in the study area. The result indicates that rice farmers utilized processing, reaping of panicles and threshing, with mean scores of 2.9, cutting of stalk, laying of paddy on stalk, stacking to dry, cleaning, milling, packing, storage. Cutting of rice stalk with mean rating of 2.8, threshing (=2.6), drying and incorporation of green manure (=2.5) as post-harvest management practices. The grand mean, of 2.7, indicates that rice farmers had high utilization of these practices. The high utilization of these practices may be attributed to rice farmers' longer years of engagement in the business, had enhanced the management of rice

grains after harvest that is targeted to reducing losses. The result corroborates with the findings of James *et al*., (2017), Mtui (2017) as they found that utilization of any technology by farmers is related to experience and risk-averse encountered during any production and post-harvest management practices.

Constraints to Rice Post-Harvest Management Practices

Table 3 shows the mean frequency distribution of the constraints encountered by farmers in rice post-harvest management practices in the study area. The result indicates that farmers encountered high constraints to rice post-harvest management practices. Furthermore, the result revealed that pest and disease infestation (.0), lack of funds (=2.8), non-access to credit (=2.9), poor extension support and inadequate machines with mean ratings of 2.5 each. Complicated technologies and lack of technical know-how on application of these practices, with mean ratings of 2.4 were identified as major constraints. The result revealed that rice farmers had very serious (=2.7) constraints to rice post-harvest management practices in the study area. The result affirms the study of Department of International Development (DFID) (2019) as they report that these constraints responses also affected rice post-harvest management practices of most rice farmers in Nigeria.

Socio-economic Determinants of Farmers' Utilization of Post-Harvest Management Practices among Farmers

The result in Table 4 showed the regression estimates of socio-economic factors influencing rice post-harvest management practices in Abia State, Nigeria. The double log function was chosen among the four functional forms as the lead equation based on a high R^2 value, number of significant factors, conformity, and agreement with a priori expectations. The F-value was highly significant at 1.0% level, which indicates a regression of best fit. The R^2 value of 0.5167 implied that 51.67% of the variability in post-harvest management was explained by the independent variables. The coefficient for sex (0.0157) was positive and significant at 5.0% level of probability. This implied that increase in male rice farmers will lead to increase in post-harvest management practices in the study area. This result was expected as men play an outsized role in the post-harvest handling and processing stage, where considerable food loss occur as technologies used for post-harvest management are mostly tedious which are handled and adopted by men (Nordhagen, 2021; International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (2023). The coefficient for education (0.0126) was positive and highly significant at 1.0% level of probability with rice post-harvest management practices in the study area. The result indicates that with increase in level of education, post-harvest management practices of rice farmers will also increase in the same proportion. This was also expected as these management practices in rice involve handling, packaging, and rice grain processing, which was expected to increase with increase in the farmers' level of education. In corroboration with the findings, Egwuonwu (2020) in his study found that farmer's exposure to higher level of education positively and significantly influence the practice of better post-harvest management. In support of the findings, Peleo *et al*., (2019) also are of the view that the eagerness to adopt post-harvest management practices by farmers increases their quest for enhanced literacy level. The coefficient for membership of social organization (0.0173) was also positive and significantly related with post-harvest management practices at 10.0% level of probability, which is in agreement with a prior expectation. Rice farmers who are members of cooperative farmers' association were expected and likely to increase their post-harvest management practices as a result of access to information available to them. Oyaniran, (2020) reported that being members of cooperative groups will generally help the farmers in accessing agricultural information on rice processing methods such as; harvesting, storage, by-products, drying and milling which are easily done through mechanical process and the facilities best accessed through cooperation. The coefficient for farm income (0.0165) was positive and significant at 1.0% level of probability. This implied that any increase in farm income will lead to a corresponding increase in post-harvest management practices by the rice farmers. This result was expected as the farmers would make a conscious effort in employing all post-harvest management measures as they engage in rice production activities. If there was an impressive income derived with a view to enhancing their economic status as reported by Coker and Ninalowo. (2018).

Conclusion

In conclusion, rice farmers had high utilization and high constraints to rice post-harvest management practices. The coefficients for sex, education, membership of cooperative and farm income were determinants of farmers' utilization of rice post-harvest management practices in the study area. It is therefore recommended that rice farmers should take advantage of cooperative membership, with the view of benefitting from the economies of scale emanating from group ownership. There is also a need to employ efficient processing and viable marketing system geared toward increased farm income through the purchase of production and post-harvest tools to minimize rice losses. Finally, educational policy that would encourage rice farmers in the country to undergo literacy and training programmes on recommended post-harvest strategies are hereby advocated.

References

Agada, O. and Ijih, B. E. (2019). Analysis of post-harvest management practices among farmers in Oju, Benue State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences*, 8(1):24 – 28.

Agro Nigeria (2019). Post-harvest handling of perishable crops in Nigeria. Available Online at

https://agronigeria.com/wp.content/uploads/2019/09/veget. Accessed on 25/01/23.

Amir, T.S. (2017). Post-harvest handling practices on vegetable crops at different stages of the distribution chain: A case study in Selangor, Malaysia. Wageningen University and Research. MSc Thesis Management Studies, Department of Social Sciences. Management Studies Group (MST). Pp.68.

Coker, A.A. and Ninalowo, S.O. (2018). Effect of post-harvest losses on rice farmers' income in Subsaharan Africa: a case of Niger state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Food Technology,* 2(3):27-34.

Department of International Development (DFID) (2019). Growth and employment in States (2018), Mapping of rice production clusters in Nigeria. A project report on growth and employment in states by the United Kingdom in Nigeria.

Egwuonwu, H. A. (2020). Post-harvest losses constitute a post-harvest management practices among rice farmers in Imo State Nigeria. European *Journal of Biology and Biotechnology*, 1(4):1-7.

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMA&RD), (2022). A paper presented by the Honourable Minister for State Mustapha Shehurri at the International Standard Organization (ISO) Certification for Nigeria Stored Products Research Institute held on August, 11, 2022 at FMA&RD building Abuja, Nigeria.

Food and Agriculture (FAO) (2021). Post-harvest losses: Discovering the full story. overview of the phenomenon of losses during the post-harvest system. Available at www.fao.org/docrep/004/ac301/Ac301e03.htm. Accessed on 23/10/18.

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (2023). Global food policy report: building inclusive food systems (Internet]. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute; 2023 [cited 2023 Jan 23]. Available from: https://ebrary.ifpri.org/digital/collection/p15738coll2/id/133646.

James, D., Bamishayi, O.M., Shamsuddeen, J., Williams, O., Olukunde, T. and Zainab, M. (2017), Analysis of the level of post-harvest losses in orange marketing case study of Yanlemo orange market in Kano State. *International Journal of Agriculture and Earth Science*, 3(4):16-24.

Mtui, M. A. (2017). Economic cost evaluation of selected vegetable post-harvest losses in Babati District Tanzania. A Thesis submitted to the Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Award of a Master's of Science Degree in Agricultural Economics of Egerton University, Tanzania, Pp.96.

Musa-Gambo, K. K. (2020). Managing post-harvest losses for improved food security in Nigeria: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research*, 2(1):116 – 123.

National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLs) Ahmadu Bello University (2022). Report of the 2022 wet season agricultural survey in Nigeria. ABU Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria.

National Population Commission (NPC) (2022). Estimated census Figures for the Thirty-Six States and Federal Capital Territory Abuja.

National Root Crops Research Institute (NRCRI), (2023). National Root Crops Research Institute Umudke Abia state, Nigeria. Weather data report from Institute meteorological station Umudike. www.nrcri.org.ng. Accessed 11th September, 2023.

Nordhagen, S. (2021). Gender equity and reduction of post-harvest losses in agricultural value chains. Global alliance for improved nutrition working paper No. 20, Pp. 18. Geneva, Switzerland

Nwaobiala, C. U. and Ubeh, C. C. (2020). Factors influencing *Fadama* III additional financing project farmers and non - farmers' rice income in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Farm Management Association of Nigeria Journal*, 19(1):1–11.

Olatinwo, L. K., Kwatachi, A. M. and Yusuf, O. J. (2019). Roles of cooperative to reduce constraints of livelihood in rice farming in Niger State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 28th annual national congress of the Rural Sociological Association of Nigeria (RuSAN) held at held at Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife Between 7 and 11 October, Pp. 41 – 44.

Oyaniran, T. (2020). Current state of Nigeria agriculture and agribusiness sector. AFCFTA Workshop. https://www.pwc.pdf.

Pelemo, J. J., Olaleye, R. S., Umar, I.S., Tsado, J. H. and Mohammed, U. (2019). Analysis of socio-economic benefits derived from cashew production in Kogi State, Nigeria, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Social Sciences* (JAEES), 2 (1):36-42.

Table 1: Selected socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area

Variables	Frequency (n=90)	Percentage
Sex		
Male	65	72.22
Female	25	27.78
Household Size (numbers)		
1-4	19	21.11
5-8	51	56.67
9-11	20	22.22
Mean ($\bar{x}$)		**6.0**
Education (years)		
No formal	7	7.78
Primary	56	62.22
Secondary	27	30.00
Tertiary	7	7.78
Annual Farm income (₦)		
50,000-100,000	2	2.22
101,000-150,000	4	4.44
151,000-200,000	9	10.00
201,000-250,000	7	7.78
251,000-300,000	13	14.44
301,000-400,000	55	61.11
401,000-500,000	2	2.22
Mean ($\bar{x}$)		**853,978**
Non-farm income (₦)		
50,000-100,000	24	26.67
101,000-150,000	8	8.87
151,000-200,000	8	8.87
201,000-250,000	4	4.44
251,000-300,000	3	3.33
301,000-400,000	5	5.56
401,000-500,000	27	30.00
None	11	12.22
Mean ($\bar{x}$)		**518,124**
Membership of Social organization (years)		
1-5	22	24.44
6-10	29	32.22
11-15	10	11.12
None	29	32.22
Mean ($\bar{x}$)		**5.33**

Source: *Field Survey Data, 2023*

Table 2: Mean frequency distribution of level of utilization of rice post-harvest management practices among farmers in the study area

Rice Post-Harvest Management Practices	Always	Rarely	Never	Total	Mean	Decision
Cutting of rice stalk	72(216)	14(28)	4(4)	**248**	**2.8**	**High**
Laying rice paddy on stalk	71(213)	19(38)	0(0)	**231**	**2.8**	**High**
Stacking it to dry	73(219)	14(28)	3(3)	**250**	**2.8**	**High**
Bundling for transport	38(76)	41(82)	11(11)	**169**	**1.9**	**Moderate**
Threshing	72(216)	18(36)	0(0)	**234**	**2.6**	**High**
Drying	82(246)	8(16)	0(0)	**232**	**2.5**	**High**
Cleaning	76(228)	10(20)	4(4)	**252**	**2.8**	**High**
Milling	79(237)	10(20)	1(1)	**249**	**2.8**	**High**
Packing	77(231)	11(22)	2(2)	**255**	**2.8**	**High**
Storage	77(231)	12(24)	1(1)	**256**	**2.8**	**High**
Processing	80(240)	10(20)	0(0)	**260**	**2.9**	**High**
Reaping of panicles	74(222)	10(20)	6(6)	**266**	**2.9**	**High**
Threshing	79(237)	11(22)	0(0)	**259**	**2.9**	**High**
Total mean ($\bar{x}$)					**34.7**	
Grand mean ($\bar{x}$)					**2.7**	**High**

Source: *Field Survey Data, 2023*
Values in parentheses are nominal Likert values multiplied by frequencies

Table 3: Mean frequency distribution of constraints encountered by farmers in rice post-harvest management practices in the study area

Constraints Encountered	Severe	Mild	Not Severe	Total	Mean	Decision
Complicated techniques	52(156)	25(50)	13(13)	**219**	**2.4**	**VS**
Poor extension support	54(162)	27(54)	9(9)	**225**	**2.5**	**VS**
Pest and disease problems	72(216)	15(30)	3(3)	**276**	**3.0**	**VS**
Inadequate machines	50(150)	37(74)	3(3)	**227**	**2.5**	**VS**
Lack of technical know how	47(141)	36(72)	7(7)	**219**	**2.4**	**VS**
Lack of funds	74(222)	28(56)	1(1)	**240**	**2.8**	**VS**
Non access to credit	61(183)	2(56)	1(1)	**240**	**2.7**	**VS**
Total mean ($\bar{x}$)					**18.3**	
Grand mean ($\bar{x}$)					**2.6**	

Source: *Field Survey, 2023*
VS = Very Serious
Values in Parentheses are Nominal Likert Values Multiplied by Frequencies

Table 4: Multiple regression of the socio-economic determinants of post-harvest management practices among rice farmers in Abia State, Nigeria

Variables	Linear	Exponential	Double Log +	Semi-Log
Constant (B_0)	53.4672	3.9792	3.7779	43.4619
	(38.63)***	(144.87)***	(27.59)***	(6.29)***
Sex (X_1)	0.9879	0.0198	0.0157	0.7858
	(2.32)*	(1.21)	(2.65)**	(3.86)***
Age (X_2)	-0.0003	-1.91e-06	-0.0093	-0.4789
	(-0.03)	(-0.01)	(-0.39)	(-0.39)
Marital status (X_3)	-0.3971	-0.0089	-0.0089	-0.3988
	(-0.47)	(-0.54)	(-0.53)	(-0.47)
Education (X_4)	0.0248	0.0005	0.0126	0.6461
	(2.22)*	(2.23)*	(3.76)***	(0.89)
Membership of Cooperative (X_5)	-0.1362	-0.0028	0.0173	-0.8472
	(-1.80)*	(-1.85)*	(2.33)*	(-2.25)*
Household size(X_6)	0.1078	0.0021	-0.0001	0.0255
	(3.11)**	(2.38)*	(-0.01)	(0.06)
Occupation (X_7)	0.0242	0.0009	-0.0036	-0.1987
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(-0.23)	(-0.25)
Farming Experience (X_8)	-0.0321	-0.0006	-0.0041	-0.2061
	(-0.99)	(-0.98)	(-0.39)	(-0.39)

Farm income(X_9)	1.74e-08	4.05e-10	0.0165	0.8175
	(0.12)	(0.14)	(3.27)***	(1.79)*
Non -farm income (X_{10})	2.59e-07	5.08e-09	0.0015	0.0785
	(0.12)	(2.88)**	(0.72)	(0.72)
Extension contact (X_{11})	0.0157	0.0004	0.0017	0.0844
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.31)	(0.30)
F-calculated	5.33	5.34	7.47	6.44
R-squared	0.4582	0.4593	0.5167	0.4685
Adjusted R-squared	0.4150	0.4170	0.4845	0.4512

Source: *Field Survey, 2023*

* p≤ 0.10, ** p≤ 0.05 and ***p≤ 0.01

+ = lead equation