Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry

2(3): 1-10, 2018; Article no.AJRAF.47182
ISSN: 2581-7418

Forecasting the Future Farm Size in Grasscutter Production in Osun State, Nigeria: A Markov Chain Approach

M. S. Olatidoye[1*], A. D. Kehinde[1] and T. Alimi[1]

[1]Department of Agricultural Economics, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJRAF/2018/v2i330019
Editor(s):
(1) Dr. Cengiz Yucedag, Professor,Department of Landscape Architecture, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey.
Reviewers:
(1) Luai Jraisat, University of Northampton, UK.
(2) Oon Fok Yew, International Business School University Technology of Malaysia, Malaysia.
(3) Marco Antonio Montufar Benitez, Institute of Basic Sciences and Engineering, Autonomous University of Hidalgo State, Mexico.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/47182

Original Research Article

Received 25 October 2018
Accepted 12 February 2019
Published 25 February 2019

ABSTRACT

Aim: The study investigated the prospects of increasing Grasscutter production and projecting the future farm size of its production in the study area. Specifically described socio-economi characteristics and some management practices of the respondents, assessed and predicted the pattern of change and the equilibrium farm size of the Grasscutter enterprise in the study area, examined the costs and returns to grasscutter production and examined the relationships between gross margin and some selected socio-economic characteristics.
Study Design: A simple random sampling technique was employed in selecting 60% of the total population of registered grasscutter farmers.
Place and Duration of Study: The study was carried out in Osun State, Nigeria between years 2016 and 2017.
Methodology: Primary data were collected through a well-structured questionnaire administration from the three agricultural zones in the State. Twenty four Grasscutter farmers each were randomly selected from each of the agricultural zones. Data were collected on demographics of grasscutter farmers, production activities in terms of inputs, outputs and their respective prices for the years

**Corresponding author: E-mail: sharonsam2016@gmail.com;*

2016 and 2017. Data were analyzed through Descriptive statistics, Markov chain, Gross margin and Pearson r test of correlation.
Results: The study revealed that male respondents (85%) dominated Grasscutter production in the study area while the mean age of respondents was 43 years. Majority (97%) of the respondents had formal education with an average grassutter farming experience of 11 years while the mean flock size was 2.5 colonies. The gross margin results showed that grasscutter production had a profit margin of ₦11,333.33/respondent/month. The mean grasscutter farm size revealed an upward trend in farm size until the year 2025 and thereafter stabilizes at about 3.3 colonies of grasscutter farm size. The correlation analysis showed significant relationship between gross margin and level of education and farming experience with r-values of 0.817 and 0.697 respectively.
Conclusion: Grasscutter production, though in small scale, is profitable in the study area and the grasscutter farmers in the study area have great potential to boost local production

Keywords: Equilibrium; gross margin; grasscutter farmers; Markov chain; profitability.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Nigeria, consumption of animal protein remains low at about 6.0 – 8.4 g/head/day which are far below the 13.5 g/head/day prescribed by [1]. Thus, the search for more sources of protein to meet up this and the population challenge. Economic indices indicate that as this population trend continues, indigenous agricultural outputs need to be increased rather than through food importation into such countries. Anigboku et al. [2] opined that in order to maximize food production and meet protein requirements in Nigeria, viable options need to be explored and evaluated. Among such alternatives is the use of livestock species that are yet to play a major role in animal production within these countries. Kusi et al. [3] submitted that the shortage of animal protein in the third world countries can be ameliorated by improving the existing conservation programme of wildlife particularly the domestication of rodents that are tractable, prolific and widely accepted to the public for consumption. Captive breeding of game species as a possible way to satisfy local demand without compromising the wild stock has also been recommended by several authors [4].

Wildlife domestication according to Olukole et al. [5], has been suggested as a possible way of improving meat supply and eliminating the threat of extinction due to poaching of some species of wild animals in Nigeria. The species advocated include: grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus*), guinea fowl and the giant African snail. Among these aforementioned, grasscutter (cane rat) is the most preferred [4]. Usually, cane rats live in small groups of family colonies, comprising a buck (male), one or more does (females) that live with their offspring. A colony on the average is usually between 1 – 5 grasscutters in the ratio 1 male to four females, where five is the optimum. Only males live solitarily [6]. Wogar et al. [7] asserted that unlike some animals which may not be killed or touched because of religious dictates, traditional taboos or prejudices, the grasscutter meat transcends religious prohibitions and Muslims who do not consume rabbit or pig are known to consume grasscutter. The high demand for grasscutter meat and the economic benefit that accrues from its sale has resulted in aggressive hunting with complete disregard for conservation of the species and the environment [8].

The grasscutter meat is a favourite one and accounts for the greater proportion of bush meat sold in West Africa. They are robust animals measuring up to 60 cm (head and body) and weighing more than 9 kg. Grasscutter is a wild hystricomorphic rodent hunted aggressively for its excellent taste and higher nutritional value when compared to other species of livestock and it does not require imported raw materials to survive [9]. Boateng [9] submitted that Grasscutter has high protein content (19- 23%) and contains less fat than most domestic animals. Beef, lamb and pork contain higher fat percentage than meat from the grasscutter. Grasscutter meat is nutritionally superior to those of domestic animals like sheep or goat because of its high protein to fat ratio and higher mineral contents couple with the fact that the meat quality is also leaner and non-cholestrogenic [10].

Domestication of grasscutter does not require much land and can even be raised in a small confined area of land. Therefore in situations where agricultural land is scarce or unavailable, micro livestock such as the grasscutter whose meat is generally preferred to conventional meat could be developed.

However, many changes have taken place in the structure of livestock production in Nigeria, most especially, in Osun State, over the past 20 years. The total number of livestock farms has been declining steadily, the worst hit being the grasscutter production sector; and the size distribution of those farms remaining in production has undergone significant negative change [3]. A number of studies have indicated that grasscutter production in Nigeria is still characterized by small farm holders [1,2,11]. Perceptibly, the socioeconomic characteristics of the small farm holders have crucial ramification on farm size and output. Adedeji et al. [12] opined that grasscutter production could be affected by farm size, farmers' age, access to credit, farming experience, educational level etc. Amina and Akhigbe-Ahonkai [13] opined that from 1995 to 2013, farm numbers declined by nearly 50% and considerable shifts occurred in the size distribution of the remaining farms and if drastic measures are not taken, grasscutter production in Osun State may go into extinction. Hence, this to a large extent accounts for the low supply of the product relative to the high demand for its meat; thus necessitating the determination of the socio-economic factors and constraints influencing its production size and to project future farm size with a view to determining what the future holds for the enterprise in the study area. It is also necessary to take another look at the grasscutter production in terms of costs and returns in order to determine the profitability and the possibility of producing grasscutter commercially particularly under the prevailing economic conditions.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to analyse factors influencing Grasscutter production and project the future farm size of its production in the study area. The Specific are

(i) to describe the socio-economic characteristics and some management practices of the grasscutter farmers;
(ii) to assess and predicte the pattern of change and the equilibrium farm size of the Grasscutter enterprise in the study area;
(iii) to examine the costs and returns to Grasscutter production and examine the relationships between gross margin and some selected socio-economic characteristics.

1.2 Theoretical Considerations

The theoretical framework of this study is built on Markov Chain Process. This theoretical model has been applied in extant literatures. See: [14,15,16]. Markov chain process is one of the probabilistic models used in the analysis of economic observations when particular time-ordered data are available [13]. A finite Markov process is a stochastic process in which the outcome of a given trial (experiment) in the time (t + 1) essentially depends on the outcome of the trial in the preceding time period (t) and this dependence holds at all the various stages of the trial. Due to the fact that economists are often interested in characterizing or summarizing how economic processes and institutions have changed through time as well as that paths they are likely to take in future time periods, finite Markov Chain analysis was employed in this study to analyze and predict the trend in mean and median farm size of cotton farms. This process is determined by specifying given set of states (S_1, $S_2 \ldots S_n$). The process can be in one and only one of these states at a given time and it moves successively from one state to another. Each move is called a step. The probability that the process moves from Si to Sj depends only on the state Si that is occupied before the step. The transition probability that the process will move from Si to Sj is given for every pair of states. Also, an initial starting point state is specified at which the process is assumed to begin. The transition probabilities P_{ij} can be represented in the form of transition matrix P

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} & S_1 & S_2 \ldots & S_n \\ S_1 & P_{11} & P_{12} \ldots & P_{1n} \\ S_2 & P_{21} & P_{22} \ldots & P_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ S_n & P_{n1} & P_{n2} \ldots & P_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

P_{ij} denotes probability of moving from S_i to S_j in the next step. Since the element of this matrix are non-negative, and the sum of the elements in any row is one, the matrix (P) is a vector, completely defines a Markov chain process, that is given this information, the outcome of say the n^{th} step, can be determined. The main distinguishing feature of a Markov process is that it is concerned with the probabilities of being in various states at any time and for moving from one state to another.

Assuming there are N farmers in the study area belonging to different categories of farmsizes. Farmers are put into categories based on farm size (colony) of grasscutter reared. Grasscutter farm sizes were grouped as follows:

Farm sizes (colony :1 male : 4 females grasscutters) per farmer was grouped such that;

1 - 5 ≡ S_1 11 - 15 ≡ S_3 21 - 25 ≡ S_5
6 - 10 ≡ S_2 16 - 20 ≡ S_4 26 - 30 ≡ S_6
and so on.

At a given period 't' the N farmers may belong to a certain number of categories S_i (where, i = 1, 2, 3…m) with each category containing $n_1, n_2 \dots n_m$, such that $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_m = N$. The data on the behaviour of this N farmers for another time period 't + 1' were collected.

For this study 't' and 't + 1' were years 2016 and 2017 respectively. During the interval between the time periods, the n_i farmers belonging to the first categories 'S_i' during the first period might have moved to a higher or lower category or remained in the same category. The probability that any farmer in the first category in period 't'moves to another category during the second period't + 1' is given by;

$$P_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}}{n_i} \quad (j = 1, 2, 3, - - -, m) \qquad (1)$$

However, constraints on elements of the probability transition matrix, P, are that the probabilities in each row should add up to 1 and that $P_{ij} \geq 0$ (for all i and j). Since Pij is the probability of a farmer in a farm size category i in period 't' to have moved to another farm size category j in period 't + 1'. Thus, it implies that P is a stochastic matrix. This matrix, P, together with an initial starting state completely defines a Markov chain process, that is, given this information, we could determine the outcome of, say, the $(t + i)^{th}$ step/ period.

Let $P^{(0)} = (^{P1}/M, ^{P2}/M \dots\dots\dots P^m/M)$ = initial proportion of farmers in the S_i (i = 1, 2, 3 … M) states at time 't', i.e. starting state or initial state or initial vector (probability vector).

Where $P_j = \frac{n_j}{N}$

and $^{P1}/M$, $^{P2}/M$ ………. P^m/M are transition probabilities.

N is the proportion of farmers in the j^{th} category. Hence, with this information, the future path of the stochastic process is given by;

$$P^{(0)} P = P^{(1)} \text{ state vector in time, t + 1}$$
$$P^{(1)} P = P^{(2)} \text{ state vector in time t + 2}$$
$$P^{(m-1)} P = P^{(m)} \text{ state vector in time, t + m} \qquad (2)$$

Alternatively, $W^{(m)}$ may be written as

$$P^{(m)} = P^{(0)} P^m \qquad (3)$$

$W^{(m)}$ is the probability vector at each intervening period state.

Hence, [17] contended that given a regular stochastic matrix, P, there exists an m x m matrix, $P^{(e)}$, to which P^m will converge as $m \rightarrow 0$ consisting of m rows which are exactly alike. That is, as the number of stages or transitions approaches infinity, Markov Chain approaches a steady equilibrium state in which the probability distribution of its states approaches stationarity.

Therefore, $P^{(0)} P^{(e)}$ gives the fixed probability vector, or equilibrium probability vector W(e) of the stochastic process.

$$\text{Hence: } P^{(m)\rightarrow} P^{(e)} \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty$$
$$P^{(o)} P^{(e)} = P^{(e)}$$
$$P^{(e)} P = P^{(e)} \qquad (4)$$

Equilibrium in this sense does not imply that there is no movement of farmers between categories, but that on the average, the proportion of farmers entering a given category per period is equal to the average proportion leaving it. Those interested in a more rigorous discussion of Markov chain analysis should consult Judge and Swanson (1961).

Hence, the structure of the grasscutter farm size for the respondents in the study area, provided the factors and conditions currently influencing farm size continue through time, was projected up to the equilibrium year.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area

The study was carried out in Osun State comprising thirty Local Government Areas and three agricultural zones, namely: Iwo (Iwo and Ikire zone), Osogbo (Osogbo and Ikirun zone) and Ife-Ijesa (Ilesa and Ife zone) respectively. The State is located in the South-West geopolitical zone of Nigeria and occupies an area of land of about 14, 875 km^2. The State is bounded in the south by Ogun State, in the North by Kwara State, in the East by Ondo and Ekiti State and in the West by Oyo State. The State is heterogenous comprising the Osuns, Ifes and the Ijeshas all belonging to the Yoruba ethnic group. The ecological conditions are conducive for an impressive diversity of livestock such as cattle, sheep, goat, pig, rabbit, grasscutter and poultry [18]. The State has a population of about 3.5 million [19] and the vegetation is characteristically that of rain forest and derived savannah with a mean annual rainfall that varies between 980 mm and 2800mm and a temperature range of 27 - 32˚C. Fig. 1 shows the zonal agricultural classification of the study area.

Fig. 1. Map of Osun State, Nigeria showing the three agricultural zones

2.2 Method of Data Collection

Primary data were collected through a well-structured questionnaire administration from the three agricultural zones in the State. Resident agricultural extension agents and the State Ministry of Agriculture, Osun, were contacted to provide the list of registered grasscutter farmers which formed the sampling frame for the study. From the list provided, in Ife-Ijesha Agricultural zone, 38 grasscutter farmers were registered, 40 in Iwo Zone and 42 in Osogbo Zone. Hence, Twenty four grasscutter farmers each were randomly selected from each of the agricultural zones to arrive at a total sample of 72 respondents. Data collected include socio-economic characteristics of farmers and farms, production activities in terms of inputs, outputs and their respective prices for the years 2016 and 2017.

2.3 Method of Data Analysis

Data collected were analysed using the following tools: Descriptive statistics, Markov Chain, Gross Margin, Pearson r test of correlation. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution and percentages were used to analyse data on socio-economic characteristics.

2.3.1 Markov chain

Markov Chain was used to analyse and project the future farm size.

2.3.2 Budgetary technique

Budgetary technique was used to estimate costs and returns of grasscutter farmers. The Gross margin (GM) represents the difference between Total Revenue and Total Variable Costs.

$$GM = TR - TVC \quad (5)$$

2.3.3 Profitability and Efficiency ratio

Various ratios were computed to ascertain the extent of the profitability of grasscutter farming enterprise, namely:

$$BCR = TR/TC \quad (6)$$

$$ESR = FC/VC \quad (7)$$

$$ROR = NR/TC \quad (8)$$

$$GM = TR - TVC \quad (9)$$

Where BCR = Benefit Cost Ratio; TR = Total Revenue; ESR = Expense Structure Ratio; FC = Fixed Costs; VC = Variable Costs; ROR = Rate of Return, NR = Net Revenue, GM = Gross Margin, TVC = Total Variable Costs.

Pearson r test of Correlation was used to determine the relationship between some selected socio-economic characteristics of respondents and the profits derived from grasscutter production. The regression model was used to determine the relationship between profitability and other variables. The model was tested using different functional forms.

The stated equation for the model is: $Y = \beta_o + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + b_4x_4 + b_5x_5 + \varepsilon_i$ (10)

Where; Y = Profit, X_1 = Sex, X_2 = Educational level, X_3 = Years of experience, X_4 = Reason for raising grasscutter, X_5 = Area of specialization and ε_i = Error term.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the socio-economic characteristics and some management practices of the respondents are presented in Table 1. If old farmers are defined as those who are above 50 years of age, then, 27.8% of the grasscutter farmers in the study area can be said to be old. The mean age of the respondents was 42.7 and 72.2% of the farmers are within the age range 41 – 50 years. This implies that young people engage in grasscutter farming business than older people and hence represents a high percentage of grasscutter farmers in the study area. The Table further shows that (84.7%) of the respondents were male thus showing the dominance of male farmers in grasscutter production in the study area. This agrees with [8] that females engage mostly in marketing; while males do most of the production processes. In addition, (97.2%) of the respondents had formal education ranging from primary to tertiary. Thus, the literacy level of the respondents is very high and this implies that grasscutter farming requires certain level of education in terms of management to ensure productivity.

The mean years of experience in grasscutter farming was 11 years thus implying that majority of the farmers had a relatively few years of experience in grasscutter farming. Experience according to Amina and Akhigbe-Ahonkai [13] and Owen and Dike [18] provides the farmers with insights on how to militate against risk and possible losses since they have become acquainted with them. It was further revealed that the average farm size of grasscutter reared per respondent was 2.5 colonies while the average litter size per kindling was 4. Majority (59.7%) of the respondents were civil servants while majority (58.3%) sourced their capital from cooperative societies. Table 1 also reveals that family labour (68%) was the predominant labour type in the study area. The modal grasscutter farm size (45.8%) was 2 colonies while majority (47%) of the respondents depend on concentrates in feeding their animals.

Table 1. Selected socio-economic factors /management practices of respondents

Parameters	Frequency N = 72	Percentage (%)	Parameters	Frequency N = 72	Percentage (%)
Age (Years)			**Major occupation**		
41 – 50	52	72.2	Farming	11	15.3
51 – 60	11	15.3	Artisans	18	25
61 - 70	9	12.5	Civil Servant	43	59.7
Gender			**Types of Labour**		
Male	61	84.7	Family	49	68
Female	11	15.3	Hired	10	13.9
Educational level			Both	13	18.1
No formal education	2	2.8	**Extension Contact**		
Primary education	7	9.7	Yes	62	86.1
Secondary education	22	30.6	No	10	13.9
tertiary education	41	56.9	**Training**		
Grasscutter rearing experience			Yes	65	90.3
1 - 5	23	31.9	No	7	9.7
6 – 10	39	54.2	**Farm size (Colony)**		
11 – 15	10	13.9	1	11	15.3
Litter size per kindling			2	33	45.8
1 ≤ 5	52	72.2	3	19	26.4
6 ≤ 10	20	27.8	4	9	12.5
Sources of fund			**Types of feed**		
Personal savings	11	15.3	Concentrates	35	48.6
Friends and relatives	5	7.0	Household wastes	6	8.3
Cooperatives	42	58.3	Grasses	13	18.1
Bank loans	14	19.4	All of the above	18	25.0

Source: Data analysis, 2017

Furthermore, (62%) and (65%) of the respondents had extension contacts and training in grasscutter production, respectively. It is believed that extension contacts and training afford farmers the opportunity to learn and improve their knowledge of grasscutter production.

3.1 Equilibrium Values, Actual and Projected Pattern of Change in Farm Size of Cotton Farms

This section presents the results of the Markov chain process used in assessing and predicting the pattern of change and the equilibrium farm size of the grasscutter enterprise in the study area. The movement of cotton farmers from one farm size category to another between the two periods (2016 and 2017) for which data were collected is presented in Table 2. From the transition probability matrix, the structure of farm size that would be cultivated by grasscutter farmers, if the factors and conditions currently influencing farm size of grasscutter farms continue through time was projected up to the equilibrium year. The mean grasscutter farm size revealed an upward trend in farm size until the year 2025 and thereafter stabilizes at about 3.3 colonies of grasscutter farm size. The results showed that grasscutter farmers in the study area are essentially small scale holders since the average farm size was 2.5 colonies (Table 1). The median farm size falls within 2 and 3 colonies farm size group. This implies that in the long run, at least (35%) of the farmers would have between 2 to 3 colonies of grasscutter farm size. This is far from being an economic size. However, the result of these findings disagree with the assertion of Amina and Akhigbe-Ahonkai [13] that grasscutter enterprise in Nigeria might soon go into oblivion but agrees with Fakoya et al. [20] and Onyeanusi et al. [21]. When equilibrium is reached by the year 2026, about (38%) and (46%) will be between 3 and 4 colonies of grassutter farm size respectively. At equilibrium (2026), the mean cotton farm size was 3.3 colonies. This implies that about (84%) of the farmers will be within the farm size category of 3.3 colonies. When the proportions of farmers in the different farm size category at the initial year were compared with that of equilibrium values, the trend is that of a general increase from smaller farm size categories to bigger ones. For instance, at the initial year (i.e 2016), about (6%) of the cotton farmers were in the 4 colonies and above farm size categories but would have increased to about (46%) at the equilibrium year. On the other hand, about 10 percent that were in the 1 colony farm size category in 2016 would have declined to (6%) by the year 2026. On the whole, this findings show that grasscutter farming in the study area is small scale and there is a high potential to boosting local production. This finding agrees with the findings of Onyeanusi and Famoyin [22] and Mensah and Okeyo [23]. However, their problem areas need to be looked into and promptly addressed for this potential to be fully realized.

Table 3 shows the average total cost of production incurred by the respondents were ₦161,517.10k ($436.53). The total cost comprises the variable and fixed costs. From the table, variable costs represent (94.1%) while fixed costs accounted for (5.9%) of the total cost of production. Additionally, feed cost represents (15.2%), labour cost (22.3%), drugs, disinfectant and vaccines (5.3%), transportation (5.9%) and other costs (such as purchase of charcoal for warmth production) represent (7.1%) of the total cost of production. The average gross revenue was ₦288,000 per respondent per annum. The average gross margin per respondent per annum was ₦136,000 while the average Net Farm Income per respondent was ₦126,458.30k. This agrees with the findings of many researchers [1], [3] and [4]. The rate of return on investment in the study area was 83%. This implies that for every ₦1.00 invested, 83k is gained in the business. Also, the Benefit cost ratio shows that grasscutter production is a profitable business since it is greater than 1. The same thing applies to GMR (2.27). The ESR results also indicate that grasscutter production has good financial strength. The result of this finding agrees with [16]. However, the result disagrees with Adedapo and Adekunle [1] who adduced low profitability as the reason for its declining farm size distribution and hence, not a viable enterprise in Southwest Nigeria. Conclusively, the various profitability ratio techniques employed indicates that the business is profitable. Thus it is profitable to produce grasscutter in the study area.

Table 4 shows the relationships between some variables and gross margin. The correlation values for education and years of experience are significant at (5%) level. We therefore accept the Ho hypotheses for both, implying that level of education and grasscutter farming experience count in successful grasscutter production. This agrees with the findings of many researchers [16], [17] and [19] in that farming experience and level of education significantly increase the level of profitability of the grasscutter enterprise.

Table 2. Annual and projected structure of farm sizes among cotton farmers

Farm size	Actual years						Projected years				
	2016	2017*	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026**
S1	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
S2	0.60	0.55	0.52	0.49	0.45	0.44	0.39	0.35	0.27	0.10	0.10
S3	0.24	0.29	0.32	0.34	0.35	0.36	0.37	0.37	0.38	0.38	0.38
S4	0.06	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.22	0.36	0.46	0.46
Total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mean	2.40	2.50	2.55	2.50	2.65	2.75	2.80	2.85	2.90	3.30	3.30

Source: Data analysis, 2017.
**Starting (initial) state probability vector*
***Equilibrium probability vector*

Table 3. Average cost and returns of grasscutter production in ₦/Year

Cost/Return	Amount (₦)	% of Total cost (TC)
Total Revenue (TR)	288,000	
Variable cost (VC)		
Cost of stocking	62,000	38.4
Feed	24,500	15.2
Labour	36,000	22.3
Drugs, vaccination and disinfectants	8,500	5.3
Transportation	9,500	5.9
Other costs(Warmth production etc)	11,500	7.1
Total variable cost (TVC)	152,000	94.1
Fixed cost (FC)		
Depreciation on Building	5518.90	
Depreciation on equipment and Machinery	3677.70	
Interest on loans	345.10	
Total fixed cost (TFC)	9541.70	
Total Cost (TC) = TFC + TVC	161,517.10	
Gross Margin(GM) = TR – TVC	**136,000.00**	
Net Farm Income (NFI) = GM – TFC	**126,458.30**	
Rate of Return of Investment (ROR) = NFI/TVC	83%	
Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) = TR/TC	1.78	
Expense Structure Ratio (ESR) = TC/TR	0.56	
Gross Margin Ratio (TR/NFI)	2.27	

Source: Computed from field survey data, 2017

Table 4. Correlation result of Socio-economic characteristics and profitability of grasscutter production

Relationship	R value	P-value	Significant	Decision
Sex vs GM	-0.079	0.547	NS	Reject Ho
Education vs GM	0.817	0.005*	S	Accept Ho
Years of experience vs GM	0.699	0.002*	S	Accept Ho

**Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level. GM = Gross Margin*

4. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the Markov chain analysis indicated an upward trend in the mean grasscutter farm size until the year 2025 and thereafter stabilizes at 3.3 colonies at the equilibrium year 2026. The trend is that of gradual increase from smaller farm size categories to bigger ones. On the whole, this finding shows that grasscutter farms in the study area is small scale and grasscutter farmers have great potentials to boost local production. The net farm income and the average rate of return on investment results showed that grasscutter enterprise in the study area, though on a small scale, was profitable and economically viable.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Adedapo AA, Adekunle AO. Economic aspects of grasscutter farming in southwest Nigeria: Implications for sustainable adoption and conservation. International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research. 2015;4(10):17–23.
2. Anigboku TU, Agbasi OE, Okoh IM. Socioeconomic factors influencing grasscutter production among cooperative farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria. International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences. 2016;4(3):43–58.
3. Kusi C, Tuah AK, Annor SY, Djang-Fordjour KT. Determination of dietary crude protein level required for optimum growth of the grasscutter in captivity. Livestock Research for Rural Development. 2012;24(10):23–35.
4. Aiyeloja AA, Ogunjimi AA. Economic aspects of grasscutter farming in southwest Nigeria: Implications for sustainable adoption and conservation. International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research. 2013;4(10):17–23.
5. Olukole SG, Oyeyemi MO, Oke BO. Gross anatomy of male reproductive organs of the domesticated grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus* Temmink). Proceedings of 25th Annual Conference of Nigerian Society for Animal Production. University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 2010;268-271.
6. Henry AJ. Reproductive performance of grasscutter does at first parity reared in humid tropical environment. Proceedings of 35th Annual Conference of Nigeria. Society for Animal Production, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 2010;155– 158.
7. Wogar GSI, Effiong OO, Nsa EE. Performance of growing grasscutter on different fibre sources. Pakistan Journal of Nutrition. 2011;11(1):51-53.
8. Taiwo AA, Fayenuwo AJ, Fajimi AK, Fapohunda JB, Adebowale EA. Supplementary Effect of Concentrate Feed on the Performance of Cane ratsFed Basal Diet of Elephant Grass. Nigerian Journal of Animal Production. 2009;36(1):153-160.
9. Boateng P. Economic analysis. International forum on Promoting Grasscutter for Business in West-Africa Accra, Ghana. 2005;2(2):12–16.
10. Addo PG, Dodoo Adjei S, Awumbila B, Awotwi E, Ankrah NA. Comparative characterization of the grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) and the guinea pig (*Cavia porcellus*) by the hystricomorph vaginal membrane perforation phenomenon. Livestock Research and Rural Development. 2007;19(14):32-48.
11. Akinola LAF, Etela IO, Emiero SR. Grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) production in West Africa: Prospects, challenges and role in disease transmission. 2015;6(4):196–207.
12. Adedeji OA, Osowe CO, Folayan JA. Socioeconomic characteristics and profitability analysis of rabbit prodution in Ondo State, Nigeria. European Journal of Physical and Agricultural Science. 2016; 3(3):10-19.
13. Amina FO, Akhigbe-Ahonkai CE. Profitability and technical efficiency of grasscutter production in Nigeria: The case of Ekiti State. Agricultural Tropica et Subtropica. 2017;50(1):27–35.
14. George KN. Application of Markov chain analysis in short term demand forecasting for agricultural inputs in Mumbai. India. India Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2010;26(2):40–56.
15. Alimi T. Application of Markov chain analysis in forecasting arable crops farm size. Nigeria Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences. 1999;8(1):27-36.
16. Hallberg MC. Projecting the size distribution of Agricultural firms. An Application of Markov process with non-stationary transition probabilities. Amerian Journal of Agricultural Eonomics. 2004; 5(2):289-302.
17. Judge GC, Swanson ER. Markov Chains: Basic concepts and suggested uses in agricultural economics. Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, AERR; 1961.
18. Owen OJ, Dike UA. Japanese quail (*Coturnixcoturnix japonica*) husbandry: A means of Increasing Animal Protein Base in developing Countries. Journal of Environmental Issues and Agriculture in Developing Countries. 2013;5(1):1-4.
19. NPC. National Population and Housing Census Report; 2006.

20. Fakoya EO, Sodiya CI, Alarima CI, Omoare AM. Information needs of farmers in grasscutter production for improving performance in Ona-Ara local government area of Oyo State. Proceedings of 33rd Annual Conference of Nigerian Society for Production. Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria; 2008.
21. Onyeanusi AE, Akinola OO, Bobadoye AO. Performance of grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) Fed Varying Level of Dietary Protein. Journal of Innovation and Development Strategy. 2008;2(3): 1-4.
22. Onyeanusi AE, Famoyin JB. Health care management of grasscutter in captivity: Assessment of causes of mortalities among rearing stock in Ibadan metropolis. Journal of Forestry Research and Management. 2005;2(5):58–66.
23. Mensah GA, Okeyo AM. Continued harvest of the diverse African animal genetic resources from the wild through domestication as a strategy for sustainable use: A case study of the larger grasscutter (*Thryonomys swinderianus*).International Livestock Research Institute. 2005;12(3): 123-132.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/47182