Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) and Profitability of Maize Production in Bokkos Local Government Area, Plateau State-Nigeria, 2015-2019

Gulesh, James O, Dr. Linda Kwon-Ndung, & Dr. Dalhatu Musa Yusha'u
Department of Political Science, Federal University of Lafia, Lafia – Nigeria

Abstract: **Necessitated by the need to increase the contribution of non-oil sector and reduce dependence on oil, the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) was developed as a new agricultural development strategy predicated on neoclassical principles with increase in maize production among others as a major priority. This paper examines the effectiveness of the policy on profitability of maize production in Bokkos Local Government Area, Plateau State-Nigeria from 2015-2019 with the aim of determining the profitability dynamics of the crop. A descriptive survey research method was adopted with 370 respondents that are members of Maize Association of Nigeria (MAAN), Bokkos Local Government Area Chapter administered questionnaires and 384 unregistered farmers participating in Focus Group Discussion. The paper utilised Rentier-State Theory as a construct. It was found that the APP increased profitability in maize production by 75% and led to increase in output. The paper recommended that government and stakeholders should prioritise increased profitability side-by-side maize production and stabilising market forces that undermine favourable pricing at all periods. Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development while formulating and implementing Agricultural Development Policies should always consider agriculture not just as business but a profitable venture for increased income towards sustainable growth and development of the sector.**

***Keyword*: Agricultural Policy & Profitability**

I. INTRODUCTION

The 2015-2017 economic recession in Nigeria reinvigorated government energy towards increasing the contribution of agriculture to the nation's economy by harnessing the potentials of other sectors among others that were hitherto affected by inflow of petro-dollar. To achieve this, a new agricultural development framework known as the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) was developed in 2016 to consolidate on the gains of Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) that was in existence since 2012. Three out of the key principles of the new document emphasised administering agriculture as a business, prioritizing crops and making it market oriented (National Association of Nigerian Traders, 2018). Similarly, to achieve food security and boost export earnings (through economic diversification), the strategy focuses on expanding production of a number of crops from 2016-2018. This includes rice, wheat, maize, soya beans and gum Arabic (World Trade Organisation {WTO}, 2017). All these fall under the crop subsector. Under this new agricultural development strategy, the States and Local Governments are expected to key in towards improving the general state of the economy and better the lots of the citizens through increased income, employment opportunities, poverty reduction and increased Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Agricultural production in Nigeria generally, comprises four dominant sub-sectors: crop production, fishery, livestock production and forestry. Crop production in particular is the most widely participatory, constituting about 84% of farmers. Maize production alone as a major farming activity by the teaming small-scale farmers whose population is put around 96% of the entire farmers (Mgbenka & Mbah, 2015), witnessed its first revolution in the early 80s which coincided with introduction of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). Going forward, the highest national output ever recorded of about 11million metric tonnes took place between 2015-2017 coinciding with the period of economic recession in Nigeria (Odemero, Oghenehogagame & Chukwujioke, 2019).

Narrowing this to Plateau State, data from Planning, Research and Statistics (PRS) Department of the Plateau State Agricultural Development Programme (PADP) (2021) show trends in maize production in Plateau State thus, 239, 430 metric tonnes was produced in 2012; 250, 940 in 2013; 258, 470 in 2014; 266, 220 in 2015; 274, 210 in 2016; 278, 320 in 2017; 398, 500 in 2018; and 420, 240 in 2019. This mirrors down to Bokkos Local Government Area (LGA) which brings to bear the following fundamental questions: Was the increase from 2015-2019 engendered by the new agricultural development strategy – APP? Does the increase also reflect the true circumstances in the implementation of diversification policy that trickled down to Bokkos Local Government Area? Were maize farmers in Bokkos Local Government Area motivated through increased in profitability, since APP treats agriculture as a business which probably surged their contribution to the national economy as evident in the GDP?

Maize is an important cereal that has many benefits to farm households, local traders and markets within Bokkos Local Government Area, Plateau State and Nigeria as a whole. Besides being a major staple food to large number of people, it serves as a source of income to both farmers and traders, raw material for industrial production and export earnings. It is owing to this that the importance of maize within the crop

production sub-sector of agriculture features prominently under the new Agricultural Development Policy. Notwithstanding this relevance of maize however, the implementation of policies that will enable the realisation of the potential of the grain to farmers and the national economy remains problematic within Nigeria's political economy. It is in the light of this that the study seeks to examine the effect of implementation of APP on profitability of maize in Bokkos Local Government Area of Plateau State, Nigeria from 2015-2019.

II. CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Concept of Agricultural Policy

Agricultural policy is a roadmap towards solving identified national or local problems that affect the performance of agricultural activities and their role in the bigger economy (Ayuba, 2018). Solving problems within the agricultural sector may not be the key issue in formulating agricultural policy. In developed nations, the major aim of agricultural policy is growth sustainability and development on a long-term basis. This is contrary to the reality in countries like Nigeria where agricultural policy is just mere a document that has not been truly been implemented to transform the sector and bring increased returns to producers.

To Ladan (2013), agricultural policy in Nigeria is the synthesis of the framework and action plans of the government designed to achieve overall agricultural growth and development. Comparing this definition with the state of agricultural development in Nigeria, it implies years of formulation of numerous policies did not impact on the sector in anyway. Unarguably, agriculture is the least rewarding sector with majority of producers being peasants who dominantly reside in the rural areas under penury.

Agricultural policy is the outlined decisions of government aimed at transforming the sector towards making it attractive and encouraging increased participation of individuals as well as local and international entities. It is a planned direction and strategy designed by government towards unlocking the fortune in agricultural for increased, production and income for improved socioeconomic conditions of the peasants.

Concept of Profitability

Profitability is a derivative of profit which is a major concept within the field of Political Economy. Discourse on the term "profit" forms the basic thrust for both liberal and radical scholars in the discipline. For instance, the disposition of Classical Political Economy aspired by Adam Smith assigned appropriation of profit to the owner of capital. It is this that spurred the intellectual theorisation of Historical Materialism and Dialects by Karl Marx who referred it as the "surplus value" (Akpuru-Aja, 1998).

Bumbescu (2015) argues that there is no consensus on the notion of profitability. However, it is only assumed that when an organisation makes profit it is profitable. Oraganisational profit or profitability is product of exploitation criticised by radical school of political economy unlike small scale production that dominates maize production in Nigeria, where farmers rely on their family members for labour, own the land and capital for production (World Bank, 2008). Directorate Agricultural Production Economics (2015) situates profit within this prism by conceiving it as the remuneration to own land, capital and management (including own and unpaid family labour).

Evans (2021) provides succinct definition and makes distinction between profit and profitability. Profit is an absolute measure of the positive gain from an investment or business operation after subtracting all expenses. Profitability is the size of the profit relative to the size of the business. Unlike profit, profitability is a relative measure of the success or failure of a business. This conception fails to realise that profitability is a derivative of profit.

From the standpoint of this study, profit is synonymous with profitability which is the net profit made from the sale of commodity (maize) by a producer as motivation that has the multiplier effect of impacting on future production and encouraging mass participation in agriculture. It is also the ability to sustain constant increase in profit from agricultural activity like maize production that engenders expansion and better the lots of farmers by improving their wellbeing and contribution to national productivity.

Theoretical Framework

Rentier-state theory is adopted as the construct for the study. The framework is attributed to the works of Mahdavy Hossein in 1970, Hazem El Beblawi in 1987 and Giacomo Luciana in 1990. Rentier-state theory explains why state decision-makers in natural resource-rich economies create and maintain growth-restricting policies. It assumes that oil and mineral abundance generate growth-restricting state intervention and extraordinarily large degrees of rent-seeking, where these rent-seeking contests are assumed to be uniformly negative in terms of the developmental outcomes they generate (John, 2010). Rentier-state is important in explaining the realities surrounding formulation of agricultural policy and factors inhibiting its implementation in a resource rich nation like Nigeria.

Inflow of oil revenue otherwise refers to as petro-dollar has over the years inhibited the formulation of agricultural development policies that have the potential of constantly increasing the profit of maize farmers and improve their productivity in Nigeria. It also weakened the institutional framework for the implementation of existing policies and newly formulated ones like the Agricultural Production Policy. The few well conceived policies have been grossly undermined by corruption, embezzlement, mismanagement, inconsistency and failure (Suberu, Ajala, Akande & Olure-Bank, 2015). Most fundamentally, large investment and export resources that can produce growth in the economy

through maize production have remained unlocked (Olukunle, 2013).

Generally, inflow of oil revenue beclouds the policy making environment and negatively impacts implementation process in Nigeria. Agricultural policies are conceived for the purpose of primitive accumulation than developing the sector, thereby continuously weakening the institutional framework.

A critique of Rentier-state theory reveals that it does not go beyond institutional analysis in explaining the circumstances bedeviling increased agricultural and maize production in Nigeria. Emphasising natural resources as basis for attitudinal failure within the policy making and implementation frameworks neglects other factors as well as external influence.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research is descriptive. Primary data is generated through survey with questionnaire administered to maize farmers. Secondary sources are also utilized.

Study Area

Bokkos Local Government Area is one among the 17 Local Government Areas of Plateau State. It is located within the upper Plateau and North-Central Senatorial District. It has a population of 268, 590 and boast of having some of the biggest maize markets in the State.

Study Population

The population for the study comprised all maize farmers in Bokkos Local Government Area whose total number as at 2019 is 157, 931. The population is projected using the following:

i. The results of 2006 population census in Nigeria.
ii. NBS (2017) reports that Nigeria's population grows by 3.2% annually.
iii. Report of NBS/CBN (2006) that 70% of Nigerians are farmers.
iv. 84% of farmers engage in maize production

From this population, two sampling frames are derived. The first being the total number of registered farmers of the Maize Association of Nigeria (MAAN), Bokkos Local Government Chapter that is 2, 110 and the second, the total number of the entire maize farmers 157, 931. Two different instruments or method of data collection were used for the two categories of farmers. For members of MAAN, questionnaire was directly administered, while for the other category, a Focus Group Discussion was conducted. .

Sample Size

Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula below is used to determine the sample sizes for both registered members of MAAN and other category of farmers. Sample Sizes of 351 and 384 were respectively obtained.

Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling technique is used for members of MAAN while cluster sampling technique is adopted for participants of Focus Group Discussion.

IV. DATA PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS

Data Presentation and Analysis

A total of 351 questionnaires were returned out of 370 administered to farmers that are regritered members of Maize Association of Nigeria (MAAN), Bokkos Local Government Area. Analysis of results obtained is made side-by-side with the outcome of Focus Group Discussion and interview carried-out to stakeholders.

Table 1: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20-30	112	32.0	32.0
31-41	111	31.5	63.5
42-52	73	20.8	84.4
53-63	30	8.6	93.0
64ABOVE	25	7.0	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 1 shows the age brackets of respondents. 32% of them fall between 20-30years, 31.5% between 31-41, 20.8% between 42-52, 8.6% between 53-63 and 7% 64 and above. Analytically, the higher the age of respondent, the less he participates in maize production. This confounds with study by Adesina and Favour (2020).

Table 2: Sex Distribution of Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid MALE	226	64.3	64.3
FEMALE	125	35.7	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 2 captures the age distribution of respondents. 64.3% being the majority comprised male, while 35.7% female. In Nigeria and many other African countries, agricultural production is dominated by the male gender because of the land tenure system that favours men (Chikaire, Anyoha, Ani & Atoma, 2014). The patriarchal practice ascribed and bestowed inheritance to farmland in favour of man than woman (Gulesh, 2016).

Table 3: The Market Condition for Maize in Bokkos LGA between 2015 and 2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid STABLE	36	10.2	10.2
UNSTABLE	150	42.7	52.9
FAIRLY STABLE	73	20.8	73.7
FAIRLY UNSTABLE	92	26.3	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 3 describes the market condition to which maize was sold from 2015-2019. 10.2% of farmers claimed the condition was stable. 42.7% refuted the claim. 20.8% opined there was fairly market stable which was countered by 26.3%.

The majority view opposes opinion shared during Focus Group Discussion. Participants argued that between 2015 and 2018 the market condition was stable due to the economic recession that Nigeria was faced with. By 2019 however, it became unpredictable and unstable heralding the end of the economic crisis. This view is a reflection of what was disclosed by 42.7% of respondents administered questionnaires as it did not delineate between the actual period of the recession (2015-2017) and the added 2019 that was an offshoot. It should be expected that the impact of the economic recession which came to an end in 2nd Quarter of 2017 will go beyond the year to 2018.

Stakeholders on the other hand explained that there was increased local demand by poultry owners for maize that stabilised market condition. Local supply did not meet demand created by ban in imports. They were of the opinion the economic crisis of the period forced government to formulate and implement agricultural policies under the APP aimed at diversifying the economy. This practice explains the dynamic of political economic of diversification in Nigeria (Adedipe, 2004).

Table 4: Effects of Market Condition for which Maize was Sold between 2015 to 2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid ENCOURAGING	102	29.2	29.2
DISCOURAGING	42	12.0	41.1
BOTH COMBINED	207	58.9	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 4 indicates the resultant effects of the market condition that maize was disposed in Bokkos Local Government Area under the study period. 29.2% of farmers purported it was encouraging and opposed by 12%. The largest number of farmers constituting 58.9% was neutral.

Outcome of Focus Group Discussion differ from views in the table where participants narrated making gains unlike the other years. They attributed this to the efforts put in place which also increased level of participation in agricultural production. Unfortunately the high rate of inflation caused by the 2015-2017 crisis undermined the value of proceed made that would have been ploughed into production. They further explained that the falling prices of maize shortly after recession which extended to 2019, made them to record less gains concomitantly coincided with the slight fall in general prices of goods and services. With this narrative, the third variable in the table where 58.9% of respondents indicated that maize production was both encouraging and discouraging which can be considered to have been influenced by the Nigeria's economic crisis and diversification effort under the APP. This position is in consonance with Adeosun, Ihemezie, Ume and Egu (2019) who assert that local price of maize significantly influences local production. Therefore, it would not be out of place to uphold this as the true representation of the views of the two categories of respondents. To further substantiate this, findings by Few Net (2017), and Olomola and Nwafor (2018) show trends in maize prices and yields that started prior and at the beginning of the recession in 2015.

Table 5: Whether Change in Prices of Maize Positively Affected Production from 2015-2019 in Bokkos LGA

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid YES	293	83.6	83.6
NO	58	16.4	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 5 shows whether change in prices of maize affected production in 2015 up to 2019. A significantly high number of the respondents about 83.6% attested that it did. Only 16.4% believed it did not.

These results agree with what was obtained from Focus Group Discussion.

Table 6: What Farmers Recorded in Bokkos LGA from Sales of Maize from 2015-2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid PROFIT	265	75.5	75.5
LOSS	86	24.5	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 6 describes whether farmers in Bokkos Local Government Area incurred profit or loss from sales of maize between 2015 and 2019. A significant percent of them about 75.5 indicated they recorded profit, while 24.5% opined they incurred loss.

Opinions from Focus Group Discussion confirmed those in the table. Majority of the respondents for instance overwhelmingly explained that they recorded profit from the sales of their grains with appreciable increase in yield. The results in the table and from Focus Group Discussion are consistent with discussion in the preceded table. This strengthens the reliable of the two instruments.

Table 7: Way(s) Change in Prices Affected Income and Maize Production in Bokkos LGA from 2015-2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid DEPLETION OF CAPITAL	71	20.1	20.1
INCREASE IN MORE CAPITAL	101	28.9	49.0
DEPLETION/INCREASE IN CAPITAL **TOTAL**	179 **351**	51.0 **100.0**	100.0

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 7 illustrates ways for which change in prices of maize affected farmers' income and maize production in Bokkos

Local Government Area within the period under study. The least, 20.1% claimed it depleted their capital as well as production, while 28.9% said it increased same. However, a very large proportion of the respondents constituting 51% inferred that it both increased and depleted their capital and maize production.

There is little a deviation between the results of the table and that of the Focus Group Discussion. Dominant view from the later group demonstrated that change in prices of maize increased their capital and production. Results in table 1 justify the outcome of what was obtained in the table that affirms the fact that market condition for maize from 2015-2019 was unstable. Price instability can bring about both loss and gain thereby fluctuating the accruing capital, as well as resources to be ploughed back into production. The implication of this is that the status of production will generally be affected (Howard & Upton, 1961). But then, to draw a meeting point between the two groups of respondents, it will be fair enough to consider the view of those who claimed it increased their capital (being the second majority), side by side with the majority of Focus Group Discussion.

Table 8: How Change in Prices and Production Influenced Farmers' Living Condition in Bokkos LGA between 2015 and 2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid POSITIVE	73	20.8	20.8
NEGATIVE	108	30.7	51.6
BOTH COMBINED	170	48.4	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 8 indicates how change in prices and production influenced maize farmers' living condition in Bokkos Local Government Area between 2015 and 2019. The smallest number of the respondents that makes up 20.8% purported the change positively influenced their wellbeing. 30.7% on the other hand opined it negatively impacted their living condition. While about 48.4% claimed it both positively and negatively influenced their living condition.

The results in the table replicate the outcome of Focus Group Discussion with the views of respondents dividing between those who ascribed the change positively and negatively impacted their well. But then, much of the respondents put together affirmed that the influence was both positive and negative. Upholding the views of the third respondents notwithstanding their numerical strength is salient considering the economic circumstances that always surround recession. While increase in prices of maize may soar earnings of farmers and probably lead to increase in production, but the problem of high inflation rate can undermine the value and the purchasing power of money at their disposal. Besides, lost of jobs by family members or relatives engaged in other activities that are negatively affected within the economy will mean increasing the responsibilities of those engaged in agriculture in the event of boom in the sector. These explanations among others may rationally justify why most of the respondents from the two target groups ascribed that change in price and production has dual impact on their wellbeing.

Table 9: Support for the Type of Change in Prices of Maize that Took Place from 2015-2019 and Under the APP

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid NO	132	37.5	37.5
YES	219	62.5	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 9 ascertains whether or not maize farmers in Bokkos Local Government Area would support the type of change in prices that took place between 2015 and 2019. Small number of the respondents, 37.5% did not support the type of change in prices that have taken place within the period. However, the majority 62.5% supported.

The results in the table are a reflection of Focus Group Discussion. But then, since respondents under this category have the latitude of elaborating their views, they decried the high prices of other commodity and services by explaining how it increased the hardship of the common farmers within the period.

Table 10: Nexus between Increased in Prices of Maize and Profitability of Production in Bokkos LGA from 2015-2019

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid VERY GOOD	26	7.3	7.3
GOOD	124	35.7	43.0
AVERAGELY GOOD	57	16.1	59.1
BAD	89	25.3	84.4
VERY BAD	10	2.9	87.2
OTHERS	45	12.8	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 13 shows the link between increased in prices of maize and profitability of production. 7.3% of the respondents claimed there was a very good connection. The majority, 35.7% assumed the nexus was just good. 16.1% believed the link was just averagely good. 25.3% asserted it was bad. 2.9% argued it was very bad, while 12.8% was undecided.

Facts obtained from Focus Group Discussion slightly conformed to the results in the table. Significant population of the respondents in this category shared the opinion that the nexus was just good against those that believed it was bad. Their opinions were not cascaded like what is obtained in the table. It was only divided into two – good or bad.

Table 11: Whether Change in Prices of Maize and Production between 2015 and 2019 is Attributed to Government Efforts towards Economic Diversification under APP

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid YES	207	59.1	59.1
NO	144	40.9	100.0
TOTAL	**351**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Work, 2021

Table 11 explains whether change in prices of maize and production during the period under study was engendered by government efforts otherwise known as policy. Majority of the respondents comprising 59.1% attributed the change to government efforts. About 40.9% however claimed it was not as a result of government action.

Government efforts based on these responses could have either positive or negative impact. Most respondents from Focus Group Discussion also attributed change in maize prices and production to government efforts. Further to this also, 90% of the interviewed stakeholders adjudged that government effort before 2015 was fairly good, specifically with the introduction of Growth Enhancement Scheme (GES), National Initiative-base Risk Sharing Agricultural Lending (NIRSAL) and other programmes under the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA). But these programmes were not as impactful to maize production that can yield much profit to farmers compared to those introduced afterwards. While the programmes under ATA were targeted at improving farmers' access to inputs, but did less in introducing policies that can increase the demand and marketability of maize within the economy. Government attitude towards food imports did not favour and encourage local production (Babban Gona, 2020).

V. CONCLUSION

The market condition for maize was unstable but somewhat encouraging as shown by tables 3 and 4, respectively. Change in prices of maize affected production and farmers recorded profit within the period under study as revealed by tables 5 and 6. However, while the capital of some maize farmers increased, that of others depleted as indicated by table 7. Thus, as a result of change in price, increase in production and profit, there was improvement in the welfare of farmers as captured in table 8. Farmers are in support of this change that took place from 2015-2019 due to the connection among price, increase production and profit as shown by tables 9 and 10. They attributed the change recorded to implementation of strategies deployed under APP which is illustrated in table 11.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The priority which places premium on increased maize production ahead of profitability should be discouraged within the policy circle. Thus, profitability should be emphasised as a panacea to improved production, or be considered under the neoliberal economy system as an integral part of maize and agricultural production in general. This is because, it is not necessary for improved production to impact on earnings of farmers that can lead to profit. But profit has the multiplier effects of improving productivity through increased capital that can facilitate access to input as well as bettering the lots of the peasants. Considering this therefore, the APP instead of treating agriculture as just "business" being one of its key principles, it should rather consider it, "a profitable business" under an all season highly backed market oriented system, aimed towards poverty reduction and improved rural and farmers' welfare.

Finally, APP should not be seen by the Nigerian government as only a policy document for revamping the economy during the period of distress, but that of sustainable growth and development of the agricultural sector. It should be improved upon by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and stakeholders as well as backed with legislation as an instrument for constantly prosecuting sustainable growth and agricultural development. The underline neoliberal components of the policy should be profit and farmers oriented with a well-defined institutional and implementation directorate under the Federal, State and Local Government Ministries of Agriculture.

REFERENCES

[1] Adedipe, B. (2004). "The impact of oil on Nigeria's policy formulation". A paper presented at a conference on, Nigeria: Maximising pro-poor growth. organized by overseas development institute in conjunction with Nigeria Economic Submit Group, from 16th – 17th June, 2004.

[2] Adeosun, P. K., Ihemezie, J. E., Ume, O. C. & Egu, U. L. (2019). The nexus between maize import, local production and local prices: Empirical analysis from Nigeria. Alanya Academic Review, 3(2). 201-213.

[3] Adesina, T. K. & Favour, E. (2020). Determinants of participation of youth-in-agricultural programme in Ondo State, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension, 20 (10). 104- 117.

[4] Akpuru-Aja, A. (1998). Fundamentals of modern political economy and international economic relations… changing with the time. Owerri: Data-Globe Nigeria.

[5] Babban Gona (2020). "Appraisal of the effect of the ban of maize importation in Nigeria". Internet material @ https://babbangona.com/an-appraisal-of-the-effect-of-the-ban-of-maize-importation-in-nigeria/

[6] Bumbescu, S. (2015). Analysis models of profitability in agriculture. Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 9(174).37-42.

[7] Chikaire, J., Anyoha, N., Ani, A. & Atoma, C. (2014). Land tenure reform: A vehicle for achieving agricultural transformation in Nigeria. Research Journal of Agricultural Science and Soil Sciences. Vol.2(9).

[8] Directorate of Agricultural Production Economics (2015). Some agricultural economic concepts, 4th ed. Pretoria: Resource Center.

[9] Evans, E. (2021). Are profit and profitability the same thing? IFAS Extension, University of Florida.

[10] Few Net (2017). Nigeria market monitoring bulletin.

[11] Gulesh, J. O. (2016). "Economic reform and agricultural production in Nigeria: The impact of Agricultural Services Training Centers on small-scale farmers' production in Plateau State from 2011-2015". An M.Sc. thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

[12] Howard, B. B. & Upto, M. (1961). Introduction to Business Finance. New York: McGraw Hill.

[13] John, J. D. (2010). "The 'Resource Curse': Theory and evidence (ARI)".

[14] Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Education and Psychological Measurement, 30. 607-610.

[15] Mgbenka, R. N. & Mbah, E. N. (2015). A review of smallholder farming in Nigeria: Need for transformation. Agricultural Engineering Research Journal, 5(2). 19-26.

[16] National Association of Nigerian Traders (NANT) (2018). Agricultural Promotion Policy "The Green Alternative": Fact sheet. Abuja.

[17] National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2017). Demographic statistics bulletin. Abuja.

[18] National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)/Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). (2006). Survey on the socio-economic activities in Nigeria for the year 2006.

[19] Odemero, A., Oghenehogagame, P. & Chukwujioke, O. (2019). Effect of liberalized and restricted trade policy regimes on production and export of maize of Nigeria. International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 174. 51 – 57.
[20] Olomola, A. S. & Nwafor, M. (2018). Nigeria agriculture sector performance review. A background report for the Nigeria 2017 agriculture joint sector review.
[21] Olukunle, T. O. (2013). Challenges and prospects of agriculture in Nigeria: The way forward. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development, 4(6). 37-45.
[22] Onyeiwu, S. (2021). Nigeria's poverty profile is grim: It's time to move beyond handouts. The Conversation, 27 June 2021.
[23] Plateau Agricultural Development Program (PADP) (2021). "Data on maize production in Plateau State".
[24] Suberu, O. J, Ajala O. A., Akande M. O. & Olure-Bank A. (2015). Diversification of the Nigerian economy towards a sustainable growth and economic development. International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences, 3(2). 107-114.
[25] Uche, I. P. (2011)."The impact of agricultural policies on Nigerian economy". A Master thesis submitted to the Department of Public Administration and Local Government, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
[26] Ugwu, D. S. & Kanu, I. O. (2012). Effects of agricultural reforms on the agricultural sector in Nigeria. Journal of Africa Studies and Development, 4(2). 51-59.
[27] World Bank. (2005). Agricultural growth for the poor: An agenda for development. Washington DC.
[28] World Trade Organization (WTO). (2017). Trade policy review on Nigeria.