

1

P.O. Box 236, Tororo, Uganda Gen: +256 - 45 444 8838 Fax: +256 - 45 4436517 Email: info@adm.buaitema.ac.ug

www.busitema.ac.ug

POST-HARVEST HANDLING TECHNOLOGIES ON MARKETABILITY OF MAIZE OF SMALL-SCALE FARMERS IN NAWAMPITI SUB-COUNTY IN LUUKA DISTRICT

UNIU BY MUWANIKA BU/UP/2017/2 8 R RA

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRIBUSINESS AND

EXTENSION IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF A BACHALOR'S DEGREE IN AGRIBUSSINESS OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

DECLARATION

I, MUWANIKA IVAN hereby declare that this dissertation titled post-harvest handling technologies on marketability of maize of small-scale farmers in Nawampiti sub-county in luuka districtsmy original work and is neither a duplication of another research study nor has it been submitted to any university or institution for any award of academic qualification or publication. Allexisting pieces of work that were used in this research report have been accordingly

Acknowledged. Date: 17/ 02/2021 Signature:

BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CLASS No.t..... ACCESS NO .: TAA 1335

APPROVAL

I have supervised this research work titled *post-harvest handling technologies on marketability of maize of small-scale farmers in Nawampiti sub-county in luuka district* by Muwanika Ivan and I have found it worthy of submission for award of Bachelor's Degree in Agribusiness at Busitema University Arapai Campus).

SUPERVISOR: Mr. AMAYO ROBERT 27, 1-Signature: .. Date: ...

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, friends, course mates and workmates for thetireless efforts they put into supporting me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks go to the Almighty God who has given me the life and strength to accomplish thisacademic work. My sincere gratitude goes to my Supervisor, Mr. Amayo Robert whohastirelessly corrected me to ensure that I deliver quality work. To all those who stood by me and supported me during my studies and compilation of this report, especially my mother, sister and brotherand my respondents; may God bless you.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION
APPROVAL
DEDICATIONiii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
ABSTRACTix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background of the Study
1.2 Statement of the problem
1.3 Study objectives
1.4Research Questions
1.5Significance of the study
1.6 Justification of the study
1.7Scope of the study
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1Production of maize
2.2Availability of Post-Harvest Handling Technologies on marketability farmers on maize 5
2.2.1Harvesting
2.3Post-harvest handling technologies on marketability farmers' maize grain
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY
3.1 Introduction
3.2Research design
3.3Description of the study area
3.4Study Population
3.5 Sample size and sample selection
3.6Sampling procedure
3.6 Method of Data Collection and Instruments to be used
3.7Data quality control 10

3.8 Data analysis
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 13
4.1Introduction
4.2Response rate
4.3 Background characteristics of the response 14
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
5.1 Introduction
5.2 Conclusions
5.3 Recommendations
5.4 Contributions of the Study
REFERENCES
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Questionnaire 45

•

•

į

.•

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1 shows the Respondentrate
Table 2: shows the Respondents' age distribution15
Table 3Respondents' experience in maize farming 16
Table 4: Shows the Respondents' average maize acreage 17
Table 5: Shows the descriptive statistics for Overall availability of post-harvest handling
technologies
Table 6: Shows the descriptive statistics for harvesting
Table 7Descriptive statistics for drying 22
Table 8: Shows the descriptive statistics for shelling
Table 9: Shows the descriptive statistics for storage 26
Table 10Correlation results for availability of post-harvest technologies and maize farmers' 28
Table 11:Shows the descriptive statistics for overall maize farmers' income
Table 12:Shows the descriptive statistics for maize quantity
Table 13: Shows the descriptive statistics for maize quality 33
Table 14:shows the statistics for price 35
Table 15Regression analysis result

igure IRespondents' sex: Source: Field data, 202115
igure 2: Respondent's average maize production. Source: Field data, 2021
igure 3: The post-harvest technologies affecting maize quality most. Source: Field data, 2021
igure 4: The post-harvest handling technologies affecting maize quantity most
igure 5 Maize characteristics considered in order to harvest maize. Source: Field data, 2021 22
igure 6Maize drying methods used by the respondents23
igure 7Maize shelling methods used by the respondents. Source: Field data, 2021
igure 8Type of storage bags used by the respondents. Source: Field data, 2021

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACE Area Cooperative Enterprise

APHLIS African Post-harvest Losses Information System

DV Dependent Variable

EAC East African Community

ECA East and Central Africa

EUT Expected Utility Theory

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

IV Independent Variable

MAAIF Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

NGO Non-governmental organization

NCBA CLUSA National Cooperative Business Association Cooperative League of UnitedStates

of America

PHHS Post-harvest handling and storage

PHHT Post-harvest handling Technology

PHLPost-harvest Loss

SSA Sub-Saharan Africa

SPSSStatistical Package for Social Scientists

UBOS Uganda Bureau of Statistics

USAID United States Agency for International Development

WFP World Food Programme



ABSTRACT

Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in the world, in agricultural economy both as food for human beings, feed for animals and other industrial raw materials. It is one of the world's leading crops cultivated over an area of about 142 million hectares with a production of 637 million tons of grain. However, its production in terms of quality and quantity has been hampered by losses due to poor harvesting methods, post-harvest handling procedures, distribution, sales and marketing policies (World Bank et al., 2011). According to Tyler (1982), the economic importance of the factors leading to high post-harvest losses varies from commodity to commodity, season to season, and the enormous diversity of circumstances under which commodities are grown, harvested, stored, processed and marketed in this study, a crosssectional survey in the collection of data form the 151 respondents in two selected perishes from Nawampiti sub-county in Luuka district the survey had two objectives including: to determine the post-harvest handling technologies and to assess farmer's perception on the effect of postharvest handling technologies of maize on farmers' income the study adopted mixed methods whereby a questionnaire survey, key informant interviews and document review were used to collect data. The data was collected from 151 respondents with 93.3 per cent response rate. The data was analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations and regression analyses for quantitative data whereas for qualitative data, thematic analysis was used. The findings revealed: According to a regression analysis, training post-harvest handling technology was the greatest contributor to maize farmers' income as the of R Square 0.298 implied that the Independent Variable (PHHT) in this model and under the conditions of this study accounted for 29.8 per cent of the variation in the Dependent Variable (Maize farmer's income). Additionally, part (b) shows the Adjusted R Square of 0. 284. So the study calls for more investment in training of farmers in post-harvest handling technologies to increase their adoption of these technologies, hence increasing farmers' income. Future studies should explore more dimensions of postharvest handling technology focusing ontraining and adoption and maize farmers' income a clear appreciation of the phenomena. Furthermore, research should be conducted to understand how weather conditions affect the rate of post-harvest loss in form of quality and quantity

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Maize is believed to have originated from Central America; a region which was dominated by wild maize, Teosinte and Zea Mexicana (ACDIVOCA, 2010: 2). An archaeological study of the bat caves in New Mexico revealed corncobs that were 5,600 years old by radiocarbon determination and most historians believe that corn was domesticated in the Tehuacan Valley of Mexico (Lance and Garren, 2002). Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in the world, in agricultural economy both as food for human beings, feed for animals and other industrial raw materials. It is one of the world's leading crops cultivated over an area of about 142 million hectares with a production of 637 million tons of grain. In Africa for instance the maize production in 2012 was 70 Million MT with leaders being South Africa (11.8 Million MT), followed by countries like Nigeria, Egypt, and Ethiopia who all doing above 6 Million MT per annum (FAO stat, 2012). Maize was introduced in Uganda in 1861 and has since become a major part of the farming system, ranking third in importance among the main cereal crops (finger millet, sorghum and maize) grown in the country (USAID, 2010). Uganda's small-scale farmers have traditionally cultivated maize for food and for income generation. But still the production is being hampered by post-harvest losses). Maize undergoes several procedures like harvesting, drying, threshing, winnowing, processing, bagging, storage, transportation, and ex-change before reaching the final consumer. The primary role of an effective post-harvest system is to ensure that the harvested food reaches the consumer, while fulfilling customer satisfaction in terms of quality, volume and safety. For the low-income countries, pre-harvesting management, processing, storage infrastructure and market facilities are either not available or are inadequate (World Bank et al., 2011) hence attributing to post-harvest losses of maize grain.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Post-harvest food loss in Africa represents a multi-faceted challenge that reduces the income of approximately 470 million farmers (The Rockefeller Foundation, 2014). Furthermore, Okoruwa*et al* (2012: 55) emphasized that post-harvest loss of grain caused by practicing of poor post-harvest technologies lower the farmers' income. The post-harvest losses represent more than 20 million metric tonnes of grain, valued at over \$4b annually in Uganda which is enough to