

Market Integration and Price Movement of white and brown cowpea in Urban and Rural Markets of Gombe State, Nigeria. A Granger - Causality Approach.

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the price movement and market integration of rural and urban price of brown and white cowpea in Gombe State, Nigeria. Monthly market prices (measured in Naira per kilogram) of brown and white cowpea in the rural and urban markets from January 2004 to December 2014. The data was obtained from the Gombe State Agricultural Development Programme (GSADP). The descriptive statistics shows that the average price of rural brown cowpea was ₦109.88k, rural price of white was ₦95.71k, urban price of brown was ₦123.18k while urban price of white was ₦110. Unit root test indicated that the prices were stationary at level 1(0) and first difference 1(1). The Johansen co-integration analysis was used to test for the relationship between markets price and the results indicated that the rural and urban markets price were co-integrated. Pair-wise granger causality test indicated a bi-directional movement between the urban price of brown and urban price of white and a uni-directional movement between rural price of white cowpea and rural price of brown cowpea. There is need for the State government to establish market information centers and information centre of the GSADP should facilitate efficient communication and flow of information concerning prices of agricultural products using the mass media and social media.

Keywords: Stationarity, Granger-causality, Market integration, Vector error correction model, Price movement,

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Agricultural Production plays an important role in economic development of Nigeria. Apart from contributing to the largest share of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), agriculture is the largest non-oil foreign exchange earner, the largest employer of labour and a key contributor to wealth creation and poverty alteration in Nigeria (Adamu et al.)(1).

The pivotal role of marketing in enhancing rural economy of the world cannot be overemphasized. One of the major functions of Agricultural marketing is to bring items of trade from surplus to deficit areas. Cowpea (*VignaUnguiculata*) is one of the agricultural produce in Gombe State, Cowpea marketing entails all the activities involved in moving cowpea from the point of production to where it is needed by the final consumer. It involves series of transaction costs which are reflected in the size of the marketing margin. These margins vary among brands, types, location and over time (Akpan et al)(3).

Cowpea is considered more tolerated to drought than soybeans and better adapted to sandy soils. Many cowpea cultivars have a vining growth habit, but modern plant breeding has also led to more upright, bush-type cultivars, (Abah et al)(2).

46 Cowpea is an important source of plant protein in the developing world and most
47 especially in West Africa; cowpea is rich in protein and constitutes a staple food for people in
48 rural and urban areas (Baributsa et al)[6].

49 The need for the marketing system of cowpea to be well structured and efficiently organized
50 cannot be overemphasized. It enhances the place of economic development by encouraging
51 specialization, generation of foreign exchange earnings, development of an exchange economy,
52 provision of income and employment opportunity for marketing (Olukosi et al)[7].

53 Instability in commodity prices among markets could be detrimental to the marketing system and
54 the economy as a whole. It could cause inefficiency in resources allocation among sellers and
55 consumers depending on the source of variability. It could also increase poverty level among low
56 income earners in the society (Polaski,)[8] (Akpan et al)[3].

57 Prices of cowpea is highly unstable between seasons and consumers pay different amount for the
58 same product in different markets separated by a few kilometers (Akpan et al)[3].

59 In order to ensure maximum returns, farmers must market their production decisions considering
60 the most favourable place, time and form in which their products could be marketed (Ayinde and
61 Idris)[13]. Prices of cowpea vary from month to month, variety and even day to day. Prices also
62 differ between various grades of cowpea and also differ between alternative markets. Farmers
63 usually sell their surpluses to rural assemblers, who in turn sell to urban wholesalers directly or
64 through commission agents, therefore Sustainability of agricultural activities is hinged on
65 effective price system. In the recent past, the markets for agricultural commodities in Nigeria
66 have shown a pattern of long-term price fall and short-term price instability (IMF, 2010)[11](
67 Akpan et al)[3].

68 During harvesting periods, prices of farm product are generally low due to surpluses : In the off-
69 season, prices rose due to reduced production and seasonal change (Akpan, 2002[] Akintunde et
70 al)[12]. Hence, agricultural commodity price is one of the major determinants of quantity of
71 commodities supplied by farmers and demanded by consumers. Price instability among
72 agricultural commodities is a regular phenomenon in markets across Nigeria and could be
73 detrimental to the Marketing system and the economy as a whole. From the literatures reviewed,
74 it can be seen that price movement and market integration studies on white and brown cowpea
75 has not been widely investigated in the study area. Therefore to achieve this the following
76 specific objectives were achieved.

- 77 i. To examine the degree of market integration of white and brown cowpea in the rural and
78 urban markets in the study area.
- 79 ii. To examine the Granger –Causality between the urban and rural price of white and brown
80 cowpea .
- 81 iii. To examine the speed of adjustment to equilibrium of white and brown cowpea in the
82 rural and urban markets in the study area.

83
84

85 Materials and methods

86 Gombe State is located between latitude $9^{\circ}30'$ and $12^{\circ}30'$ N and longitude $8^{\circ}45'$ and $11^{\circ}45'$ E
87 of the Greenwich meridian. It lies within the North east region of Nigeria and occupies a total
88 area of about 20,265 square kilometres. The State had, as at 1998 an estimated population of
89 1,820,415 inhabitants (NPC, 2006).The projected population is about 2,275,518 people in 2016.
90 It is a confluence of economic activities by its position as a meeting point for business people
91 from the surrounding State. The State share boundary with Yobe and Borno to the north east,

92 Taraba and Adamawa to the south and Bauchi to the west .This advantage has made the state
93 vibrant in all respects. It has agriculture as the mainstay of its economy with the production of
94 varieties of cash crops with large percentage of the populace engaged in farming and agro allied
95 activities. The soil is very fertile for crops like cowpea, maize, sorghum, millet, groundnut
96 among others that are cultivated in the study area. The State has eleven (11) Local Government
97 Areas grouped into three senatorial zones. Gombe north comprising of
98 Gombe,Kwami,Dukku,Nafada and Funakaye and Gombe central comprising Yamaltu/Deba and
99 Akko Local Government areas while Gombe south comprises of Billiri, Balanga,Kaltungo and
100 Shongom Local Government areas respectively (www.gombe.state.gov.ng)[17].

101
102 **Data Collection**
103 The data for this study was sourced from Gombe State Agricultural Development Programme
104 (GSADP). Secondary data on monthly prices of brown and white cowpea in rural and urban
105 market spanning from 2009- 2014 was collated.

106 .

107 **Empirical Models**

108 **Testing for Unit Root.**

109 A variable is said to have a unit root if it is non-stationary (Vavra and Goodwin,)[15]. A time
110 series that has a unit root is known as a random walk. Vavra and Goodwin)[15] defined a random
111 walk as a process where the current value plus an error term defined as a white noise.

112 A variable is said to contain a unit root or is 1 (1) if it b non-stationary. The use of data
113 characterized by unit roots may lead to serious error in statistical inference. According to Vavra
114 and Goodwin[15].

115
$$y_t = \beta y_{t-1} + E_t \text{-----} (1)$$

116 If equation (1) equals one, the model is said to be characterized by unit root (the equation
117 becomes the random walk model), and the serious is non-stationary (Vavra and
118 Goodwin)[15].For a series to be stationary, must be less than unity in absolute value.

119 Hence, stationary requires that $-1 < \beta < 1$.

120 The reason for unit root is to determine whether the series is consistent with 1(1) (integrated
121 order of one) process with a stochastic trend. (Welson and Plosser, 1982 and Jasehus, 1993). The
122 commonly used test for the presence of unit root are the t-test proposed by Dickey-Fuller (1979)
123 & the alternative test proposed by Philips &Perron)[9].

124

125 **Co-integration Test**

126 Co-integration test is concerned with estimating long-run economic relationships among non-
127 stationary and integrated variables. Variables are said to be integrated when they share common
128 unit root and the sequence of stochastic shock is common for both. Co-integration is a powerful
129 concept that allows capturing the equilibrium relationship even between non-stationary series (if
130 such equilibrium relationship exists) within a stationary model (Vavra and Goodwin,)[15]. If the
131 series indicates that the series are co-integrated, then one can test for transmission of price.

132 **Model Specification**

133 **Augmented Dickey Fuller Test (ADF)**

134
$$\Delta P_{it} = \beta + \beta_i T + \alpha_i P_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^k b_j \Delta P_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \text{-----}(2)$$

135 **Where;**

136 Δ = the difference operator

137 T= time trend

138 β =drift parameter

139 β_i, α_i and b_i =coefficients

140 ϵ_t = error term. (Dickey and Fuller, 1979)

141 **Johansen co- Integration Model**

142
$$\Delta P_t = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_i \Delta P_{t-1} + \Gamma_k \Delta P_{t-1} + \Pi P_t + U_t \text{-----}(3)$$

143 **Where;**

144 $P_t = n * 1$ vector containing the cowpea price series at time (t)

145 Δ = the first difference operator

146 Γ_i and $\Pi = n*n$ matrix of parameters on i th and k th lag of P_t

147 (Johansen and Juselius,1990)

148 Decision Criteria:

149 * Reject at the 5% level.

150 * Reject the null hypothesis if the value of the trace and Max statistic greater than 5% critical
151 value, otherwise ,fail to reject the null hypothesis.

152 **Vector error correction model(VECM)**

153 The vector error correction model(VECM) restricts the long –run behavior of the endogenous variable to converge to their co-
154 integrating relationship while allowing for a short run adjustment. it is a restricted VAR designed
155 for use with nonstationary series that are known to be integrated. The Vector Error Correction
156 Model (VECM) is an extension of co-integration method and this is what is used for this study to
157 analysis price movement because it separates short and long-run market dynamics (Conforti,)[4].

$$158 \Delta y_t = \beta_0 + \sum_{t=1}^n \beta \Delta y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \delta \Delta x_{t-1} + \psi Z_{t-1} + u_t$$

159 $Z = ECT$ and is the OLS Residual from the long-run co-integration equation.

160 $\psi =$ speed of adjustment.(it measures the speed at which y returns to equilibrium after a change
161 in X.

162 Cointegrating equation: $Z_{t-1} = ECT_{t-1} = Y_{t-1} - \beta_0 - \beta_1 X_{t-1}$

163 **Granger Causality Test**

164 After undertaking co- integration analysis of the long run linkages of the various market pairs ,
165 and having identified the market pairs that are linked, an analysis of statistical causation will be
166 conducted .The causality test uses an error correction model (ECM) of the following form;

167 The Granger Model

$$168 R_{pt} = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i U_{pt-1} + \sum_{j=1}^u \beta_j R_{Pt-j} + E_t \text{ -----(4)}$$

169 **Where:**

170 R_{pt} = rural market price

171 U_{pt-1} = urban market price

172 U = number of observations

173 m = number of lags

174 E_t =error term

175 α and β =parameter to be estimated. (Baulch,1997)

176 Results and Discussions

177 Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of white and brown cowpea in the study area (2009-2014).

	Ruralpb	Rural pw	Urbanpb	Urbanpw
Mean	109.8750	95.70833	123.1806	110.0000
Median	100.0000	90.00000	110.0000	100.0000
Maximum	210.0000	200.0000	250.0000	250.0000
Minimum	62.00000	30.00000	64.00000	64.00000
Std. Dev.	35.98393	32.03011	44.52830	36.54941
Skewness	1.659353	1.205355	1.802193	2.382366
Kurtosis	5.418819	5.882478	5.891071	9.540859
Jarque-Bera	50.59349	42.36061	64.04968	196.4566
Probability	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
Sum	7911.000	6891.000	8869.000	7920.000
Sum Sq. Dev.	91933.88	72840.87	140776.7	94846.00
Observations	72	72	72	72

179

180 Source: Gombe State Agricultural Development Programme (GSADP), 2018, table is computed
 181 by Authors and price expressed in nominal terms. Unit of measurement (₦/kg).

182

183

184 The mean price of 1 kg of brown cowpea in the rural market was ₦109.86k with a minimum
 185 price of ₦62 and maximum price of ₦210. The mean price of 1 kg of white cowpea was
 186 ₦95.71k with a minimum price of ₦30 and a maximum price of ₦200/kg. The mean urban price
 187 of brown cowpea per kg was ₦123.18k with a minimum price of ₦64 and a maximum price of
 188 ₦250/kg while the mean urban price of white cowpea was ₦110/kg with a minimum price of
 189 ₦64 and a maximum price of ₦250/kg. The prices of both white and brown cowpea were
 190 positively skewed to the right. The result of the kurtosis shows that the prices were leptokurtic
 191 meaning that the kurtosis are greater than 3 and are flat tailed. The standard deviation in the rural
 192 pw and urbanpw followed similar pattern (32.03011 and 36.54941) which indicates that the
 193 change in both prices assumed similar pattern, the same goes for ruralpb and urbanpb (35.98393
 194 and 44.52830).

195

196 Table 1a: Augmented Dickey- Fuller Unit root test result of price series (2009 -2014)

Market price series	price level 1(0)	Lag	First Diff (1)	Lag
197 Rural PB	7.9630 ***	(0)	9.5130***	(1)
198 Rural PW	4.9477 ***	(0)	11.7228 ***	(0)
199 Urban PB	3.6052 ***	(0)	8.2934 ***	(0)
200 Urban PW	5.3491 ***	(0)	13.0761 ***	(0)

Source: Authors extract.

Significant at 1%

201 H_0 : Price series has a unit root202 H_A : Price series has no unit root

203

204 The result in the table shows the stationary test for urban and rural prices of brown and white
 205 cowpea. The results indicate that the variables were stationary both at levels 1(0) and at first
 206 difference 1(1) this is done in order to avoid a spurious regression and errors as a result of the
 207 data generating process. Therefore, the null-hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative.
 208 Thus, the price series were stationary both at levels 1(0) and first difference 1(1) are requirements
 209 for the Johansen co-integration analysis. The result is in agreement with the findings of
 210 Mafimisibi et al., 2014, Akintunde et al [12].

211

212

213

VAR Lag Order Selection Criteria

Endogenous variables: RURALPB RURALPW URBANPB

URBANPW

Exogenous variables: C

Sample: 2009M01 2014M12

Included observations: 66

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-1160.626	NA	2.50e+10	35.29170	35.42440	35.34414
1	-1100.122	111.8400	6.49e+09*	33.94310*	34.60664*	34.20530*
2	-1091.469	14.94687	8.15e+09	34.16573	35.36008	34.63767
3	-1076.120	24.65206	8.43e+09	34.18544	35.91062	34.86714
4	-1068.167	11.80770	1.10e+10	34.42932	36.68532	35.32077
5	-1047.699	27.91191*	1.01e+10	34.29390	37.08073	35.39511
6	-1034.065	16.93901	1.16e+10	34.36560	37.68326	35.67657

* indicates lag order selected by the criterion

LR: sequential modified LR test statistic (each test at 5% level)

FPE: Final prediction error

AIC: Akaike information criterion

SC: Schwarz information criterion

HQ: Hannan-Quinn information criterion

214
 215 From the VAR Lag Order Selection criteria table above the Akaike Information Criterion(AIC),
 216 Final prediction error(FPE),Schwarz information criterion(SC), and Hannan-Quinn information
 217 criterion(HQ) all selected a lag length of one(1) while sequential modified LR test statistic
 218 selected lag length of five(5).So we go with a lag length of one (1).

219
 220
 221 Test for co-integration between urban and rural market price of cowpea (white and brown).

222 Table 2: Johansen Co-integration result (2009-2014)

Market pair	Trace Statistic	Critical Value (5%)	Max Eigen value	Critical value	Hypothesized No of CE (S)
Rural- Urban PB	32.57	15.49	21.03	14.26	At most 1
Rural PB- Rural PW	34.44	15.49	20.62	14.26	At most 1
Rural PW- Urban PW	34.44	15.50	23.45	14.26	At most 1
Urban PB- Urban PW	35.91	15.50	23.22	14.26	At most 1

223 Source :Authors Extract.

224 * Significant (P < 0.05)

225
 226 The co-integration test carried out on all the price series to determine the existence of long-run
 227 relationship between the price series using Johansen co-integration test gave the result presented
 228 in Table (2). Both the trace statistics and maximum Eigen value indicated two co-integrating
 229 vectors for brown and white cowpea market price at 5% level of significance.

230
 231 The null hypothesis of co-integration, $r = 0$ is rejected This is because the trace statistic for the
 232 null hypothesis of $r = 0$ were greater than the critical value of 5%. This implies that rural – urban
 233 market price for these commodities are co-integrate and there is significant existence of long-run
 234 market relationship. It also indicates that a perfect price transmission of formation exist in both
 235 urban and rural markets of cowpea. When there is perfect transmission of price in a network of
 236 markets, producers, marketers and consumer, will realize the appropriate gains from trade
 237 because correct price signals will be transmitted down the marketing chain. This is in line with
 238 the findings of (Ojiako et al[14] and Izeke et al[16].

239
 240 Table2a : Cointegraing Equation

1 Cointegrating Equation(s)	Log likelihood	-768.3542
241 Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)		
242 RURALPB	URBANPB	
243 1.000000	0.007707	
244	(0.41555)	

Table2b : Cointegrating Equation

	1 Cointegrating Equation(s)	Log likelihood	-760.7569
246	Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)		
247	RURALPB	RURALPW	
248	1.000000	-0.322020	
249		(0.59799)	
250			

251

Table2c : Cointegrating Equation

	1 cointegrating Equation(s)	Log likelihood	-614.6303
252	Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)		
253	RURALPW	URBANPW	
254	1.000000	-0.724583	
255		(0.07677)	

Table 2d : Cointegrating Equation

	1cointegrating Equation(s)	Log likelihood	-621.1777
	Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)		
	URBANPB	URBANPW	
	1.000000	-1.222191	
		(0.07616)	

Source: From Authors extract.

256 From the above co-integrating equations(Table 2a -2d),the signs of the coefficient is reversed in
 257 the long-run, and this shows that in the long-run falling price of urban price of brown cowpea are
 258 associated with the rising price of rural price of brown cowpea vice- versa, in table 2b, the
 259 coefficient is reversed in the long-run and this shows that in the long-run the rising price of urban
 260 price of white cowpea is associated with the rising price of rural price of brown cowpea vice-
 261 versa. Table 2c in the long-run shows that the rising price of urban white cowpea is associated
 262 with the rising price of urban price of brown cowpea vice versa, table 2d ,in the long run shows
 263 that the rising price of urban price of white cowpea is associated with the rising price of urban
 264 price of brown cowpea and vice versa.

265

266 **VECM RESULT**

267 Speed of Adjustment coefficients

268

269 The speed of adjustment coefficient given as -0.935 and -0.866 for the rural price of brown
270 cowpea and urban price of white cowpea. The negative sign indicates a move back towards
271 equilibrium. The results indicate that if there is a positive direction for long-run equilibrium the
272 markets tends to respond with a decrease if both rural and urban prices of brown cowpea and
273 white cowpea prices. The rural price of Brown cowpea tends to respond faster relative to urban
274 price of white cowpea. The adjustment coefficient was statistically significant at 5% suggesting
275 that the urban price of white cowpea is weakly exogenous. This suggests that movement in urban
276 price of white cowpea is less affected by the price of rural price of Brown cowpea. This means
277 that the long-run equilibrium after exogenous shocks is restored.

278 The speed of adjustment coefficient is given as -0.5514 and 0.4407 for rural price of white and
279 urban price of brown cowpea. The results indicate that if there is a positive deviation from long-
280 run equilibrium the markets tend to respond with decreases in both rural and urban price of
281 cowpea. The rural price of white cowpea tends to respond faster compared to urban price of
282 brown cowpea , and at long run it will converge at equilibrium while the that of urban price of
283 brown cowpea will not converge at long-run.

284 The adjustment coefficient was statistically significant at 5% suggesting that the urban price of
285 brown cowpea is weakly exogenous.

286

287 Estimated VECM with RURALpb as target variable:

288

$$289 \Delta \text{Ruralpb} = 0.935060 \text{ect}_{t-1} + 0.097148 \Delta \text{Ruralpb}_{t-1} + 0.112009 \Delta \text{Urbanpb}_{t-1} + 0.086067$$

290

291 Cointegrating equation(long-run)

292

$$293 \text{ect}_{t-1} = 1.000000 \text{Urbanpb}_{t-1} - 0.519536 \text{Urbanpn}_{t-1} - 46.29201$$

294

295 Estimating VECM with URBANpw as target variable

296

$$297 \Delta \text{Urbanpw} = -0.0866278 \text{ect}_{t-1} - 0.025234 \Delta \text{urbanpw}_{t-1} - 0.083578 \Delta \text{urbanpb}_{t-1} + 0.295933$$

298

299 Cointegrating equation (long-run)

300

$$301 \text{ect}_{t-1} = 1.000000 \text{Urbanpw}_{t-1} - 0.696457 \Delta \text{Urbanpb}_{t-1} - 24.30492$$

302

303 Estimating VECM with Ruralpw as target variable

304

$$305 \Delta \text{Ruaralpw} = -0.55147 \text{ect}_{t-1} + 0.101959 \Delta \text{Ruralpw}_{t-1} - 0.390509 \Delta \text{urbanpw}_{t-1} + 0-187129$$

306

307 Cointegrating equation (long-run)

308

$$308 \text{ect}_{t-1} = 1.000000 \text{Ruralpw}_{t-1} - 0.836287 \Delta \text{urbanpw}_{t-1} - 3.6580507$$

309

310 Estimating VECM with URBANpb as target variable

311

$$312 \Delta \text{Urbanpb} = 0.440712 \text{ect}_{t-1} - 0.197389 \Delta \text{urbanpb}_{t-1} + 0.374656 \Delta \text{Ruralpb}_{t-1} + 0.237327$$

313

314 Cointegrating equation (long-run)

315

$$316 \text{ect}_{t-1} = 1.000000\text{Urbanpw}_{t-1} - 1.924795\Delta\text{Ruralpb}_{t-1} + 89.10264$$

317

318 Table3 : Granger- causality for urban and rural prices of white and brown Cowpea(2009-2014).

319

Direction of causality	No of lag	F-statistic	Decision
320 Urbanpb → Urbanpw	1	4.94277(0.0295)	Rejected
321 Urbanpw → Urbanpb	1	11.6964(0.0011)	Rejected
322 Ruralpb→ Urbanpw	1	1.23686(0.2700)	Accepted
323 Urbanpw → Ruralpb	1	11.2936(0.0013)	Rejected
324 Urbanpb→ Ruralpw	1	1.83690(0.1798)	Accepted
325 Ruralpw → Urbanpb	1	3.55414(0.0637)	Accepted
326 Ruralpb→ Ruralpw	1	1.14766(0.2878)	Accepted
327 Ruralpw → Ruralpb	1	04.17977(0.0448)	Rejected
328 Ruralpw→ Urbanpw	1	0.19863(0.6572)	Accepted
329 Urbanpw → Rural pw	2	0.01206(0.9129)	Accepted

Source : Author's Extract

330 Value in parenthesis= probability level.

331

332 From table 3 above the pair wise Granger causality test shows that the rural and urban price of
333 brown and white cowpea does not granger cause each other except for urban price of
334 brown(urbanpb) that that granger cause urban price of white(urbanpw) and also urban price
335 white granger cause urban price of brown cowpea,urban price of white cowpea(urbanpw)
336 granger cause rural price of brown(ruralpb), rural price of white(ruralpw) also granger cause
337 rural price of brown cowpea(ruralpb). There are two uni-directional movement of price and one
338 bi-directional movement.

339

340 Summary and Recommendation

341

342 The study used statistical and econometric method to analyze the movement of price and market
343 integration of white and brown cowpea in the rural and urban markets of Gombe State, Nigeria
344 .The result for the unit root test between the rural and urban prices of white and brown cowpea
345 shows that the prices were stationary at level 1(0) and at first difference 1(1). T he Johansen co-
346 integration test revealed that the urban and rural markets were integrated at long-run, and VECM
347 result revealed that the prices will converge at long run to equilibrium except for urban price of

348 brown cowpea. The Granger –Causality test revealed that two markets exhibited uni- directional
349 movement of price and one bi- directional movement of price.

350 Therefore, based on the discoveries of this study, it is recommended that the Gombe State
351 government should help in putting marketing infrastructures in place especially in rural areas,
352 also effort should be made to reduce excessive charges by revenue collectors on the road from
353 rural to urban centers. The State agricultural development programme should intensify effort to
354 create a proper information sharing centers through the use mass media (radio, television etc)
355 and even social media to facilitate efficient flow of information to cowpea farmers and
356 consumers both within and outside the State.

357

358 REFERENCES

359

360 1. Adamu, M.T, Biwe, E.R and Suleh, Y. G (2013). Socio-Economic Characteristics
361 Of farmers under National Fadama Development Project in Biliri Local Government
362 Area of Gombe State, Nigeria Projournal of Agricultural Sciences, research 1 (2) 7-21.

363

364 2. Abah, D and Tor, I.E (2012). Cost and returns of cowpea Enterprise in Lafia Local \
365 Government of Nasarawa State, Nigeria. Production Agriculture and Technology PAT
366 December, 8 (2): 59-67.

367

368 3. Akpan, S.B, Udoh, E.J and Udo, U.J (2014) monthly Prices Analysis of Cowpea

369 (Bean) and maize in AkwaIbom State, Southern Nigeria. International journal of food and
370 Agricultural Economics ISSN 2147-8988 Vol. 2 No2PP65-86.

371 4. Conforti P. (2004). Price Transmission in selected Agricultural Markets FAO Commodity
372 and Trade Policy Research Working Paper 7.

373 5. Dickey D. A and fuller, W. A (1979). Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive
374 time series with a unit root. J. AM Stat. Ass. 74(366): 427 – 431.

375

376

377 6. Baributsa, D. Lowenbery – Deboer, J. Murdock, L, Moussa, B (2010) profitable
378 Chemical –free cowpea storage technology for smallholder farmers in Africa
379 opportunities and challenges 10th international working conference on stored product
380 protection, international programs in Agriculture, 615W State street, Purdue University,
381 West Lafayette pp. 1046-1052.

382

383 7. Olukosi, J.O Isitor, S.V and Ode, M.O (2005). Introduction to agricultural
384 marketing and prices; Principles and Application. Living book series, G.U Publication,
385 Abuja pp106.

386

387 8. Polaski, S. (2008). Rising food prices, poverty and Poha Round. Carnegie

388 Endowment for international peace, principles and application. Living book series, G. M
389 Publication Abuja. 15-20.

390 9. Philips P.C and Perron P. (1988). Testing for a unit root in time series regression.
391 Biometric 75(2): 335 - 346.

392
393
394 10. Akpan, S.B (2002). Analysis of Gross Margin Efficiency of rice, beans and Garri
395 in delected markets in Cross River state. (Unpublished undergraduate project work,
396 Department of Agricultural Economics). University of Calabar, Nigeria November, 5th pp
397 110-120.

398
399 11. International Monetary Fund (2010). In S.BAkpan, E.JUdoh and U.JUdo (2014)
400 Monthly Price Analysis of cowpea (beans) and maize in Akwa-Ibom State, Southern
401 Nigeria International Journal of food and Agricultural Economics Vol. 2 No 2 pp 65-86.

402
403
404 12. Akintuade, O.K, Yusuf, S.A, Bolarinwa, A.O and Ibe, R.B (2012) Price formation
405 and Transmission of staple food stuffs in Osun state, Nigeria. ARPN Journal of
406 Agricultural and biological Science, Vol. 7, No. 9 pp 699-710.

407
408 13. Ayinde, O.E and Idris, A.O (2014). Effect of Socio-Economic Factors on Ruck
409 Behaviour of farming Household. An Empirical evidence of small scale crop producers in
410 Kwara State, Nigeria Agricultural Journal. 3(6): 447-453

411
412 14. Ojiako, I.A, Ezedinma, C. Asumugha, G. N and Nkang, N.M (2013) Partial
413 Integration and Price Transmission in selected cassava products markets in Nigeria: A
414 case of Lafun World Applied Sciences, Journal, 18 (9): 1209-1219.

415 15. Vavra P and Goodwin B. (2005). Analysis of Price Transmission along the food chain
416 (No. 3) OECD Publishing.

417
418 16. Izekor, O.B, Alufohai, G.O and Eronmwon, I (2016). Analysis of Market
419 Intergration and price variation in Garri Marketing in Edo State, Nigeria.

420 17. www.gombestate.gov.ng accessed on the 27th June, 2017.