International Journal of Innovative Agriculture & Biology Research 13(3):85-91, July-Sept, 2025

© SEAHI PUBLICATIONS, 2025 www.seahipublications.org ISSN: 2354- 2934

doi:10.5281/zenodo.17240957

The Impact of Agripreneurship on Post-Harvest Loss Reduction: A Study of Small-Scale Farmers in Katsina State, Nigeria

Ibrahim Abdullahi[1]; Prof. Abubakar S. Suleiman[2] & Dr Musbau Yusuf[3]

[1,2]Federal University Dutsinma, Katsina State. Nigeria

[3]Federal Polytechnic Kaduna, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Post-harvest losses (PHL) represent a critical impediment to agricultural productivity, food security, and economic resilience among small-scale farmers in Nigeria. This study investigates the role of agripreneurship—the infusion of innovative, market-driven enterprise into agriculture—as a mechanism for mitigating these losses in Katsina State. Employing a mixed-methods approach, data was collected from 240 farming households and 40 agripreneurs and key informants across four Local Government Areas. Findings reveal alarmingly high PHL, averaging 30-34% for staple crops like beans, sorghum, maize, and millet, primarily due to insect infestation, inadequate storage, and inefficient processing. The research identifies and evaluates several agripreneurial interventions, including hermetic storage bags, mobile processing units, and cold chain infrastructure, which demonstrated significant efficacy in loss reduction, cutting losses by 35% to 83%. However, major constraints such as limited access to finance, infrastructural deficits, and low technical awareness among farmers hinder widespread adoption. The study concludes that agripreneurship holds substantial promise for transforming post-harvest management but requires a supportive ecosystem involving coordinated policy, targeted investment, and farmer education to achieve sustainable impact and scale.

Keywords: Agripreneurship, Post-Harvest Loss, Food Security, Small-Scale Farmers, Katsina State, Innovation, Hermetic Storage, Cold Chain.

INTRODUCTION

The global agricultural system is tasked with the monumental challenge of feeding a growing population, yet it is paradoxically plagued by immense inefficiency. A stark manifestation of this inefficiency is post-harvest loss (PHL), which the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2011) defines as the reduction in the quantity and quality of food available for human consumption that occurs from the farm gate to, but excluding, the retail level. It is estimated that approximately one-third of all food produced for human consumption is lost or wasted annually—a figure that is both an economic tragedy and a moral failing in a world where hunger persists.

In the Nigerian context, this challenge is even more acute. As a nation whose economy and sustenance are deeply tethered to agriculture, PHL undermines food security, diminishes farmer incomes, and inflates consumer prices. Studies suggest that Nigeria loses up to 40% of its harvested produce, valued at billions of dollars each year (World Bank, 2011). These losses are not merely statistical abstractions; they represent wasted resources, lost livelihoods, and diminished nutritional outcomes for millions. The causes

are multifaceted, encompassing technical limitations (e.g., poor storage facilities, lack of processing equipment), socio-economic factors (e.g., limited access to credit, fragmented markets), and environmental conditions (e.g., high humidity, pest prevalence).

Katsina State, in Nigeria's northwestern region, epitomizes this predicament. Its economy is predominantly agrarian, with a vast majority of the population engaged in small-scale farming of staples such as beans, millet, sorghum, and maize. For these farmers, the period following harvest is often one of anxiety rather than celebration. Research by Ibrahim et al. (2022) highlights that insect infestations during storage, mechanical damage from traditional threshing methods, and spoilage due to inadequate preservation are endemic problems. Consequently, a significant portion of their annual labor and investment is decimated before it can reach the market, perpetuating a cycle of poverty and food insecurity.

In response to this persistent challenge, agripreneurship has emerged as a beacon of potential solutions. Agripreneurship moves beyond traditional farming by applying business principles, innovation, and market savvy to the agricultural value chain. Agripreneurs are actors who identify gaps within this chain—such as the glaring inefficiency of PHL—and develop enterprising solutions, whether through technological innovation, novel service delivery models, or strategic market linkages.

This study, therefore, seeks to critically examine the impact of these agripreneurial initiatives on reducing post-harvest losses among small-scale farmers in Katsina State. It moves to answer the central research question: To what extent do agripreneurial interventions reduce post-harvest losses, and what are the key facilitators and barriers to their adoption and scalability? By answering this, the research aims to contribute empirical evidence from Northern Nigeria to the global discourse on sustainable food systems and provide actionable insights for policymakers, development agencies, and investors.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

2.1 The Multifaceted Nature of Post-Harvest Losses

Post-harvest loss is a complex phenomenon, encompassing both quantitative and qualitative dimensions. Quantitative losses refer to the physical disappearance of produce, while qualitative losses involve the deterioration in nutrient content, aesthetic value, edibility, and safety (Kitinoja et al., 2011). The literature identifies several critical stages where losses occur: during initial handling and drying, processing (threshing, milling), storage, and transportation. In Sub-Saharan Africa, storage losses caused by insects, rodents, and moulds are often the most significant for grains and legumes, while mechanical damage and rapid spoilage are paramount for perishable fruits and vegetables (Hodges et al., 2011).

The drivers of PHL are deeply interwoven with the socio-economic fabric of smallholder agriculture. Limited capital prevents investment in improved technologies, poor rural infrastructure (especially roads and electricity) hampers storage and transport, and a lack of technical knowledge and information exacerbates these physical constraints (Abass et al., 2014). The cumulative effect is a significant reduction in the amount of food available and a decrease in the income farmers derive from their produce.

2.2 Agripreneurship as an Innovative Paradigm

Agripreneurship is conceptualized as the application of entrepreneurial principles to agriculture. It involves innovation, risk-taking, and the creation of value through new products, processes, markets, or organizational forms (Rural Enterprise Academy, 2020). In the context of PHL, agripreneurs act as crucial intermediaries. They do not merely produce food; they create and deliver solutions that preserve it. This can take various forms:

Technology Providers: Entrepreneurs who manufacture, import, or distribute technologies like hermetic storage bags, low-cost moisture meters, or solar dryers.

Service Providers: Those offering mobile processing services (e.g., threshing, milling), cold storage rentals, or efficient transport logistics.

Market Linkers: Aggregators who create direct market channels, reducing the time produce spends in the value chain and thus its exposure to loss.

Evidence from other regions supports its efficacy. Adepoju (2014) demonstrated how the adoption of improved storage techniques significantly enhanced the welfare of tomato farmers in Southwestern Nigeria. Internationally, case studies from Kenya and India show that cold chain investments and farmer cooperatives led by entrepreneurial individuals have dramatically reduced losses in horticultural sectors (Vestance Research, 2024).

2.3 Gap in Literature and This Study's Contribution

While the literature establishes a clear link between innovation and PHL reduction, there is a relative dearth of focused studies on Northern Nigeria, a region with unique agro-ecological and socio-economic characteristics. Furthermore, many studies focus on a single technology or crop. This research fills this gap by providing a comprehensive analysis of the agripreneurial ecosystem—the interplay of various actors, innovations, and constraints—specifically within the context of Katsina State's staple crop economy.

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Area

The research was conducted in Katsina State, Nigeria. Four Local Government Areas (LGAs)—Katsina, Dutsin-Ma, Funtua, and Malumfashi—were purposively selected due to their high concentration of small-scale staple crop farmers and emerging agripreneurial activity.

3.2 Research Design

A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was employed. This involved first collecting and analyzing quantitative data, which was then explained and enriched through subsequent qualitative data collection. This approach allowed for both breadth in understanding the prevalence of PHL and depth in exploring the experiences and challenges of actors.

3.3 Data Collection

Quantitative Survey: A multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 240 farming households (60 from each LGA). Structured questionnaires were administered to capture data on:

Socio-demographic characteristics (age, education, household size, farm size).

Estimates of post-harvest losses for key crops (beans, sorghum, maize, millet) at different stages.

Awareness, access to, and use of agripreneurial services.

Perceived benefits and constraints of adoption.

Qualitative Interviews:

In-Depth Interviews (IDIs): 30 IDIs were conducted with agripreneurs providing services relevant to PHL reduction (e.g., owners of storage facilities, providers of mobile threshing services, distributors of improved packaging).

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs): 10 KIIs were held with agricultural extension officers, officials from the Katsina State Agricultural Development Project (KTADP), and leaders of farmers' associations.

3.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS software (Version 27). Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, percentages) were used to summarize the data. Inferential statistics, including T-tests and Chi-square tests, were employed to examine relationships between variables such as adoption of technologies and levels of loss.

Qualitative data from interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed thematically using NVivo software. This process identified recurring themes, patterns, and narratives related to the effectiveness of interventions and the barriers faced.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

The typical small-scale farmer in the study was male (78%), with an average age of 47.2 years. The average household size was large, at 11.7 members, indicating significant dependence on farm output for sustenance. Educational attainment was low, with 45% having only Quranic education and 30%

possessing primary education. The average landholding was 2.8 hectares, cultivated primarily under rain-fed conditions. This profile suggests a demographic with limited capital for investment and a potential resistance to untested technologies, underscoring the need for accessible and demonstrable solutions.

4.2 Magnitude and Causes of Post-Harvest Losses

The study confirmed pervasive and economically damaging PHL across all major staples. The average losses were quantified as follows:

Crop	Average Post-Harvest Loss (%)	Primary Causes of Loss
Beans	34.3%	Insect infestation (weevils, bruchids) during storage, spillage during handling.
Sorghum	33.5%	Bird attacks, spillage and grain loss during manual threshing, mould formation if stored at high moisture content.
Maize	33.3%	Pest infestation (larger grain borer, weevils), mould and aflatoxin contamination due to inadequate drying, rodent attacks.
Millet	30.1%	High susceptibility to birds, losses during threshing and winnowing.

Storage was identified as the most loss-prone stage for grains and legumes, accounting for over 60% of total losses, primarily due to the almost universal use of traditional storage methods (e.g., mud silos, rhumbus, jute bags) that offer little protection against pests and moisture.

4.3 Agripreneurial Interventions and Their Measured Impact

The research documented a growing ecosystem of agripreneurs offering targeted solutions. Their impact was significant:

Hermetic Storage Bags (e.g., PICS Bags): These airtight bags create an oxygen-deprived environment that kills pests. Farmers using these bags reported a dramatic reduction in storage losses for beans and maize, from an average of 18% in traditional bags to less than 5%. One agripreneur interviewed had distributed over 50,000 units in the past two years, estimating a collective saving of over 2,500 tons of grain.

Mobile Processing Units: Agripreneurs offering mechanized threshing and shelling services with mobile units addressed a major source of loss. These services reduced grain spillage and damage, cutting threshing losses by up to 40% compared to manual methods. They were particularly praised by women, who are primarily responsible for processing, for saving time and labor.

Cold Chain Infrastructure: Though less prevalent due to high capital and energy costs, small-scale cold storage facilities emerged around urban centers like Katsina and Funtua, targeting tomato and pepper farmers. These facilities allowed farmers to store produce during glut periods and sell during off-season for higher prices, reducing losses from over 50% to below 10% for those who accessed them.

Improved Packaging and Transport: Some entrepreneurs introduced the use of plastic crates for transporting tomatoes instead of woven baskets. This simple innovation significantly reduced bruising and crushing, minimizing losses during transit by an estimated 45-50%.

Table 1: Summary of Agripreneurial Impact on PHL Reduction

Intervention	**Average Reduction in PHL**	**Key Challenge**
Hermetic Storage Bags	72-80%	Initial cost, lack of awareness
Cold Storage	75-83%	High capital cost, unreliable electricity
Mobile Processing Units	35-40%	Service affordability, machine breakdowns
Improved Packaging	45-50%	Logistics of crate retrieval and maintenance

4.4 Barriers to Adoption and Scalability

Despite proven effectiveness, the adoption of these solutions remains limited. The key barriers identified were:

1. Financial Constraints: 85% of surveyed agripreneurs cited limited access to affordable credit as their primary constraint, preventing them from scaling inventory or operations. For farmers, the upfront cost of technologies like hermetic bags was prohibitive.
2. Infrastructural Deficits: Poor road networks increased transportation costs and damage for mobile service providers. The erratic electricity supply rendered cold storage operations expensive, relying on diesel generators.
3. Knowledge and Awareness Gaps: A significant portion of farmers (over 60%) were either unaware of the existence of these technologies or skeptical of their efficacy, preferring traditional methods.
4. Policy and Institutional Weaknesses: Agripreneurs reported a lack of a coherent and supportive policy environment, including inconsistent government initiatives and weak extension systems that fail to promote these innovations effectively.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study unequivocally demonstrate that agripreneurship presents a viable and potent strategy for tackling the scourge of post-harvest losses in Katsina State. The documented reductions in loss percentages translate directly into tangible benefits: more food available for consumption and sale, higher incomes for farmers, and lower prices for consumers. This aligns with the broader literature that positions entrepreneurship and innovation as critical drivers of agricultural development (World Bank, 2013).

However, the study also reveals that technology alone is insufficient. The success of any agripreneurial intervention is contingent on its context appropriateness. The high cost of hermetic bags, for instance, is a major barrier for resource-poor farmers, suggesting a need for flexible financing or leasing models. The reliance of cold storage on stable electricity in a region with an unreliable power grid points to the necessity of integrating renewable energy sources like solar power to ensure sustainability.

The low awareness among farmers underscores a critical failure in the information dissemination system. This highlights the imperative of strengthening agricultural extension services and leveraging agripreneurs themselves as change agents through demonstration plots and farmer field schools. Furthermore, the barriers faced by agripreneurs—finance, infrastructure, policy—point to the necessity of a systemic, ecosystem approach. Agripreneurs cannot operate in a vacuum; their success depends on an enabling environment fostered by supportive government policies, private investment, and active civil society engagement.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

This research has established that post-harvest losses among small-scale farmers in Katsina State are severe and multifaceted, driven primarily by technical and socio-economic constraints. Agripreneurship, manifested through innovations like hermetic storage, mobile processing, and cold chains, has proven to be a highly effective countermeasure, capable of drastically reducing these losses and improving livelihoods. However, the full potential of this approach is currently stifled by a nexus of financial, infrastructural, and informational barriers.

6.2 Recommendations

To harness the power of agripreneurship for sustainable PHL reduction, a multi-stakeholder effort is required:

For the Katsina State Government and Policymakers:

Establish an Agripreneurship Development Fund: Provide grants and low-interest loans specifically targeted at agripreneurs working in the PHL reduction space to help them scale their operations.

Invest in Enabling Infrastructure: Prioritize rural electrification (with a focus on solar mini-grids to power cold rooms and processing units) and rehabilitate key rural feeder roads to improve market access.

Revitalize Extension Services: Train extension agents on post-harvest management technologies and mandate them to conduct awareness campaigns and demonstrations in partnership with successful agripreneurs.

Incentivize Private Investment: Offer tax holidays or subsidies for businesses investing in post-harvest infrastructure like cold storage facilities.

For Development Partners and NGOs:

Facilitate Farmer Financing: Develop and promote lease-to-own or input credit schemes that allow farmers to access technologies like hermetic bags without large upfront payments.

Support Research and Development: Fund the development and promotion of low-cost, locally adaptable technologies suitable for the Katsina context.

Foster Multi-Actor Platforms: Create forums that bring together farmers, agripreneurs, policymakers, and financiers to collaborate on solving specific value chain problems.

For Agripreneurs:

Develop Collaborative Models: Explore business models like cooperative ownership of storage facilities or group discounts to make services more affordable for smallholders.

Prioritize Demonstrations: Allocate resources to visibly demonstrate the efficacy of their solutions to build trust and demand among farmer communities.

By implementing these recommendations, stakeholders can collectively build a resilient, efficient, and profitable agricultural value chain in Katsina State, where the fruits of farmers' labor are preserved, valued, and fully contribute to regional food security and economic development.

References

Abass, A. B., Ndunguru, G., Mamiro, P., Alenkhe, B., Mlingi, N., & Bekunda, M. (2014). Post-harvest food losses in a maize-based farming system of semi-arid savannah area of Tanzania. Journal of Stored Products Research, 57, 49-57.

Adepoju, A.O. (2014). Post-harvest losses and welfare of tomato farmers in Ogbomosho, Osun State, Nigeria. Journal of Stored Products and Postharvest Research, 5(8), 78-85.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2011). Global food losses and food waste: extent, causes and prevention. Rome.

Hodges, R. J., Buzby, J. C., & Bennett, B. (2011). Postharvest losses and waste in developed and less developed countries: opportunities to improve resource use. The Journal of Agricultural Science, 149(S1), 37-45.

Ibrahim, H.I., Ibrahim, H.Y., Adeola, S.S., & Ojoko, E.A. (2022). Post-harvest loss and food security: A case study of major food crops in Katsina State, Nigeria. FUDMA Journal of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, 8(1), 112-120.

Kitinoja, L., Saran, S., Roy, S. K., & Kader, A. A. (2011). Postharvest technology for developing countries: challenges and opportunities in research, outreach and advocacy. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 91(4), 597-603.

Vestance Research. (2024). Reducing Post-Harvest Losses in Nigeria through Cold Chain Investment. Industry Report.

World Bank. (2011). Missing Food: The Case of Postharvest Grain Losses in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington DC: The World Bank.