



## **Determinants of Farmers' Satisfaction with the Price of Cocoa in Ghana**

**Benjamin Tetteh Anang<sup>1\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Faculty of Agribusiness and Communication Sciences, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.*

### **Author's contribution**

*The sole author designed, analyzed and interpreted and prepared the manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2016/20714

#### Editor(s):

(1) Zhao Chen, Department of Biological Sciences, College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences, Clemson University, USA.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Odinakachukwu Ejiogu, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria.  
(2) Sallahuddin Hassan, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/11896>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 5<sup>th</sup> August 2015**  
**Accepted 14<sup>th</sup> September 2015**  
**Published 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015**

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper sheds light on one key aspect of the liberalisation of export crop marketing in developing countries which has received a lot of research attention, namely pricing. The government of Ghana has been criticised by many researchers for its stance against price liberalisation in the cocoa sector, owing to its stringent monopoly over pricing. The current study does not delve into the pros and cons of price liberalisation, but seeks to investigate the factors influencing producers' satisfaction with pricing. Using cross-sectional data and a logit model, the study revealed that farmers' age, educational status and farm income were the significant factors influencing producers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa in Ghana. The paper concludes that attempts to draw the youth into cocoa farming is not likely to be successful considering the disenchantment of younger farmers with cocoa pricing in Ghana.

*Keywords: Cocoa price; Ghana; liberalization; logit model; satisfaction.*

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [benjamin.anang@uds.edu.gh](mailto:benjamin.anang@uds.edu.gh), [abtben@yahoo.com](mailto:abtben@yahoo.com);

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Cocoa is central to the economy of Ghana and historically has been the most dominant crop in terms of government policy in the agricultural sector. After relinquishing its number one global producer status due to decline in production, Ghana is currently the world's second largest producer of the crop after Cote d'Ivoire [1,2] and produces nearly a fifth of the world's total output [3].

Cocoa production plays a very strategic and important role in the economy of Ghana [4-6] and the history of its production and pricing is one of the most important in the country's political economy. Export earnings from cocoa production provided a major source of revenue for the post-independent economy of Ghana and the crop continues to support Ghana's socio-economic development through the inflow of foreign exchange earnings and employment creation. Cocoa production is an important source of livelihood for many smallholder producers in the country. According to [7], as a result of favourable external conditions and internal reforms, cocoa has become the driver of growth and poverty reduction in Ghana. However with the discovery of oil, it is speculated that cocoa's influence on the Ghanaian economy is likely to diminish if Ghana fails to learn from the mistakes of oil producing countries in the developing world.

Due to external pressure to liberalise the cocoa sector, the government opted for a partial liberalisation policy, instead of a fully liberalised market. Ghana thus remains the only major cocoa producing country without a fully liberalized marketing system [2,3]. The introduction of liberalisation, though partial, brought significant changes in the cocoa sector such as prompt payment, and the choice to sell to the preferred buyer. The introduction of private buyers, among other things, was intended to bring about efficiency in cocoa marketing, guarantee farmers ready market and cash payment. It was also intended to generate a number of production incentives to the producers of the crop [8].

The government of Ghana has been criticised for overtaxing cocoa farmers, particularly in the era prior to liberalisation. The price received by cocoa farmers was considered to be far below the freight-on-board (fob) price, a situation that was considered as a disincentive to production.

The pricing of cocoa remains the prerogative of the Ghana Cocoa Board (COCOBOD) Producer Price Review Committee. The control over pricing has been questioned by some researchers on the basis that competitive cocoa-purchasing markets have the tendency to stimulate efficiency and reduce delivery costs, leading to higher price for producers [9].

According to [10], there are no monopolistic tendencies in the Ghanaian cocoa sector as no single buyer holds a market share large enough to induce monopolistic practices. This scenario is attributed to the absence of price competition. Furthermore, the Ghana Cocoa Board (COCOBOD) only sets a floor price, which means that technically, buying companies could pay farmers prices higher than the official producer price [2]. However, buyers rarely paid farmers a price above the floor price. As noted by [10], buyers compete for market share through non-price mechanisms like the provision of incentives, input subsidies, and cash rewards to farmers.

[10] found that in the absence of price competition, an interesting marketing scenario has emerged in the Ghanaian cocoa sector with producer-buyer loyalty serving as the key determinants for gaining market share. Licensed cocoa buying companies have devised ways to ensure that they win the loyalty of farmers and these include prompt payments, involvement in the social activities of communities, provision of credit and supply of inputs, among others. In return, farmers pledge their loyalty to buyers who keep to their promises and offer certain incentives and cash rewards. Market reform has also brought more benefits to farmers than the period prior to partial liberalisation [11].

This paper is a follow up on previous studies by this author that investigated the impact of liberalisation of cocoa marketing from the perspective of producers. The current study focuses attention on the price farmers receive for their produce and their satisfaction with the pricing. To achieve this, the paper solicited the views of farmers about their satisfaction with the price of cocoa offered by the government. The objective is to determine the socio-economic factors that influence farmers' satisfaction with the government pricing of cocoa in Ghana. Since the response is binary, in which case a farmer is either satisfied or not, a binary choice model was used to analyse the data. The logit model was

chosen for this study because of its wide application in modelling binary responses.

## 1.1 Literature Review

There have been attempts by researchers in previous studies to determine the factors which influence satisfaction and dissatisfaction of individuals about development interventions, public policies, among others [see 12-16]. The literature on satisfaction of individuals is dominated by consumer satisfaction in the domain of consumer studies. However, there are satisfaction studies applied to farmers' mostly in develop countries where literature is available. In the context of developing countries, literature on the determinants of farmers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction is hard to find, which highlights the importance of this current study.

[17] studied the determinants of farmers' satisfaction with farming and life in general. They found that farmers' global satisfaction with life was related to their satisfaction with farming. Net farm income was found to determine farm satisfaction while education was associated with dissatisfaction with farming and life in general. The authors noted that perceived rewards of farming are important determinants of satisfaction with farming and life in general.

Research has shown that older employees are more satisfied and more committed to their work ([18, pp.189]. [13] have found this to be true of farmers as well.

Education is an important variable which has been found to influence satisfaction. [17] observed that education increases the individual's capacity to achieve goals but also expands the individual's awareness of alternatives and the rewards expected from his or her activities. This means that, the gap between expectation and accomplishment tends to increase with education, a situation which has been found to depress an individual's global and job-related sense of wellbeing [18]. However, other researchers have found positive relationship between life satisfaction and education [13,15]. [17] hypothesized satisfaction with farming to be positively related to education.

[19] analysed the factors influencing farmers' satisfaction with a voucher system China. They showed that gross income, size of arable land and the varieties purchased by farmers were important determinants of satisfaction with the

voucher system. Gender, age and education were found to be insignificant determinants of satisfaction in the study.

[20] also studied the determinants of the satisfaction rate of the "New Rural Farming Cooperative Medical System" in China. Using an ordered probit model, the author found the determinants of satisfaction to include income, health level, medical service accessibility, reimbursement experience and hospitalization propensity. Age, gender, and distance to the medical center were some of the other variables included in the model.

[21] also studied the determinants of farmers' satisfaction with their irrigation system in Nigeria using a logit model. They found that fertilizer availability on time, farmers' output, plot size, timely water release and location of the farm plots influenced farmers' satisfaction with irrigation.

[22] investigated the factors influencing level of satisfaction with a growth enhancement support scheme among farm families in Kaduna State, Nigeria using a multinomial logit regression model. They observed that the level of satisfaction with the scheme increased among families with higher farming experience and education but decreased with age and extension visit.

The current study is motivated by the fact that all the studies reviewed did not examine satisfaction which price, which is very important to producers. As indicated by [17], the perceived rewards of farming are important determinants of satisfaction with farming and life in general. Thus the present study is significant and relevant in filling the knowledge gap in terms of the determinants of farmers' satisfaction with pricing in the Ghanaian cocoa sector.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The following section is a presentation of the study area, data, analytical and empirical model for the study.

### 2.1 Study Area and Data

The study was conducted at Bibiani-Anhwiaso-Bekwai District in the Western Region which is regarded as the leading cocoa producing region in Ghana. The District is found in the forest belt and experiences an average annual rainfall

between 1200 mm and 1500 mm. The rainfall distribution is bimodal. The agro-climatic conditions of the area permit the growing of crops such as cocoa, rubber, maize, cassava, plantain and cocoyam. Data for the study was collected from 80 randomly selected cocoa farmers located in four communities in the Bibiani-Anhwiaso-Bekwai District. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with the respondents. Out of the 80 respondents, 78 provided complete information and were used in the study.

## 2.2 Analytical Framework and Empirical Model

The study employs the logit model to analyse the data due to the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable. As noted by [23,24], OLS regression is inadequate when the dependent variable is discrete. While we only observe the values of 0 and 1 for the dependent variable (y), there is a latent, unobserved continuous variable  $y^*$  that determines the value of y. The logit model estimates the probability that the dependent variable is 1 ( $y = 1$ ), that is, the probability that the event occurs.

If we denote satisfaction with pricing by  $y_i$ , then  $y_i = 1$  if farmer is satisfied and  $y_i = 0$  if unsatisfied. The binary outcome model estimates the probability that  $y = 1$  as a function of the independent variables (x). Therefore,

$$\Pr(Y_i = 1 | \mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Phi(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad (1)$$

Where  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a vector of parameters and  $\mathbf{x}$  is a vector of explanatory variables influencing satisfaction with pricing.

There are three different models that can be estimated depending on the functional form of  $F(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})$ . In the linear probability model, we have  $F(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}$  [that is,  $\Pr(Y_i = 1 | \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ]. However, the regression model has a problem in that the predicted probabilities are not restricted to lie between 0 and 1. As a result we do not employ the regression model when we have a binary dependent variable. Rather, we employ logit model for which  $F(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})$  is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the logistic distribution. The model is expressed as

$$F(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{e^{\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{1 + e^{\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}}} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})} \quad (2)$$

where  $\Lambda$  = the cumulative probability distribution function of the logistic distribution. The predicted probabilities are now limited between 0 and 1.

The Logit model specification for the study can be written as:

$$y_i^* = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j x_{ji} + v_i \quad (3)$$

$$\text{So that } y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  represents a vector of random variables,  $v$  is a random disturbance term, and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a vector of unknown parameters to be estimated by the method of maximum likelihood.

The marginal effects of the logit model is calculated as

$$\partial p / \partial x_j = \Lambda(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})[1 - \Lambda(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})]\beta_j = \frac{e^{(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})}}{(1 + e^{(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})})^2} \beta_j \quad (5)$$

The logit model for the study was specified as follows:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^5 \beta_j x_{ji} + v_i \quad (6)$$

where = satisfaction with pricing (=1 if satisfied, 0 otherwise),  $x_1$  =age;  $x_2$  = education (binary): 1 if educated, 0 otherwise;  $x_3$  = sex (binary): 1 if male, 0 otherwise;  $x_4$  = farm size;  $x_5$  = farm income.

The variables used in the study and their expected signs are given in Table 1.

## 2.3 Choice of Variables Used in the Study

The choice of the variables included in the logit model to analyse farmers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa in Ghana are discussed in the following section.

Age has been widely used by many researchers as a variable to explain satisfaction [13,18,20-22]. The age of farmers is anticipated to influence their perceptions and satisfaction of cocoa pricing since perceptions are formed with the passage of time. In addition, older farmers are expected to be more experienced in farming

**Table 1. Description of variables used in the model**

Variable	Description	Expected sign
Satisfaction with price	Dummy: 1 if satisfied; 0 otherwise	
Farm size	Farm size in acres	+/-
Farm income	Farm income in Ghana Cedis	+
Age	Age of farmer in years	+/-
Sex	Dummy: 1 if male; 0 for otherwise	+/-
Education	Dummy: 1 if educated; 0 for otherwise	+/-

so that they can make better informed choices compared to younger farmers. As family size increases for older farmers, their expectations of higher income could also influence their perception of the price they receive for their produce. Older farmers are therefore hypothesized to be less satisfied with the price of cocoa.

Gender differences can also play a role in farmers' satisfaction with pricing. This is because male farmers are usually breadwinners of their families and the expectation of higher income can influence their perceptions about price. Male farmers are therefore hypothesized to be less satisfied with the price of cocoa. [20] included gender as a variable in the determination of satisfaction with a cooperative medical system in China and observed a significant effect of gender on satisfaction.

Education enables the individual to critically assess situations particular issues of economic importance. Educated farmers who are well-informed are likely to make better informed decisions and the knowledge of the price system could influence their perceptions about price. In addition, educated farmers have a higher opportunity cost of labour and will therefore anticipate higher rewards for their labour. It is therefore anticipated that educated farmers will be less satisfied with the price of cocoa. As the educated farmers interact with other workers in paid employment, this is likely to influence their perceptions. If the notion that farmers are inadequately remunerated in most developing economies, then the likelihood of dissatisfaction with pricing will be high for the educated cocoa farmer. Education has been used as a variable in satisfaction studies by many researchers [21,22], thus justifying the choice of the variable in the present study.

It is anticipated that farmers with larger farms may hire labour for farm operations and the high cost of operation may impute the desire for higher returns from farming. As such, farmers with large farms will anticipate improved prices

and may therefore be less satisfied with the price of cocoa. On the contrary, if farm size translates into more output, then farmers with large farms are likely to be more satisfied with pricing compared to small farm owners. [19] included farm size as a variable in a study of farmers' satisfaction with an Agricultural Inputs Voucher (AIV) system in China. The variable showed a negatively significant relationship with satisfaction with the AIV system.

An increase in farm income is expected to give a positive perception of price while low income is expected to generate the opposite effect. Hence income is expected to have a positive relationship with satisfaction. [19] included the income variable in a study of farmers' satisfaction with an Agricultural Inputs Voucher (AIV) system in China. The research however reported a negatively significant relationship with satisfaction.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study and the discussion of the main findings are presented in the following section. A brief summary statistics of the respondents is followed by the distribution of the respondents according to their satisfaction with pricing. The maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters of the logit model are presented thereafter.

#### 3.1 General Description of the Respondents

About 40 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the price of cocoa. This means that majority of cocoa farmers were dissatisfied with the price they receive for their produce. The mean age of respondents was 48 years which implies that cocoa farmers are not very young. They have the advantage of experience but with increase in age, many are likely to decline in their productivity. More than 80 percent of the respondents have obtained some level of formal education. Less than 20 percent did not receive

any formal education. Even though the variable is a dummy and therefore does not provide quantitative evidence of the quality of education possessed by the respondents, it nonetheless remains an important finding that reveals that majority of cocoa farmers in Ghana have attained some level of formal education. Close to 90 of the respondents were males, implying that cocoa farming is dominated by men. The result is expected because men usually dominate in the area of cash crop production in the country due to the pattern of land ownership and customs and traditions that favour men when it comes to ownership of productive resources. Annual income from cocoa farming was GH¢1937 on average. Average farm size was 7.8 acres, implying the respondents are smallholder cocoa farmers. It is reported that the cocoa sector in Ghana employs over 800,000 smallholder farm families [25]. These smallholder farm families derive about 70 – 100% of their annual household incomes from cocoa, hence the importance of pricing to farmers. There are an estimated 350,000 cocoa farms in the country which portrays the cocoa sector as a vast economic sector if we take the entire value chain into consideration.

A comparative analysis of the main characteristics of the respondents shows that adopters had significantly higher farm income but were significantly younger than non-adopters. These variables are therefore likely to influence adoption of fertilizer by respondents. Adopters also had bigger farm size as well as greater

access to finance and the government mass cocoa spraying program. However the mean difference was not significant. Adopters however had fewer contact with extension and smaller household size with insignificant mean difference.

### 3.2 Distribution of Respondents According to Satisfaction with Pricing

The characteristics of respondents are contrasted on the basis of satisfaction status in Table 3. Farmers who were satisfied with the price of cocoa were older and had higher farm income. The mean difference of the age variable was significant while that of income was insignificant. Nearly all (96%) of the respondents who were dissatisfied with pricing were educated compared to 63 percent who expressed satisfaction with pricing. Hence the education variable is likely to decrease satisfaction with pricing. The mean difference of the education variable was statistically significant. Respondents who were dissatisfied with pricing had larger farm size compared to those who were satisfied with the price they received for their produce. This suggests that farm size is likely to decrease satisfaction with pricing. However the mean difference was not statistically significant. Finally, 94 percent of farmers who were dissatisfied with pricing were males compared to 81 percent who expressed satisfaction. The mean difference was statistically significant at the 1 percent level.

**Table 2. Characteristics of respondents**

Variable	Mean	Std. deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Satisfaction with price	0.410	0.495	0	1
Age	47.56	10.982	25	65
Education	0.821	0.386	0	1
Sex	0.885	0.322	0	1
Farm size	7.763	5.756	2	32
Income	1937	2029	204	10200

**Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to satisfaction with pricing**

Variable	Satisfied (N = 32)	Dissatisfied (N = 46)	t-test
Age	50.63	45.44	-2.098**
Education (1 = educated)	0.625	0.957	1.671*
Sex (1 = male)	0.813	0.935	4.092***
Farm size	7.406	8.011	0.454
Income	2155	1785	-0.790

\*\*\*, \*\* and \* represent statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level respectively

### 3.3 Determinants of Farmers' Satisfaction with the Price of Cocoa

Table 4 shows the results of the logit analysis of the factors influencing farmers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa in Ghana. The model diagnostics reveal an overall good fit of the data as indicated by the significance of the LR Chi-square test. This test is a joint test that all the variable coefficients, except the intercept, are zero. The p-value of 0.00 is less than the 0.05 significance level so we reject the null hypothesis that the variable coefficients are jointly equal to zero. The percentage of correct classification of 73.1 also indicates a good fit of the model. The significant factors determining farmers' level of satisfaction were age of the farmer, farm size and farm income.

The age of the farmer exhibited a significantly positive relationship with satisfaction with price, implying that satisfaction with pricing increases with age. In other words, older farmers are more satisfied with the price of cocoa than younger farmers. A unit increase in farmers' age increases the probability of satisfaction by 0.01. The satisfaction of experienced farmers with the price of cocoa may be attributed to their long engagement in farming and longer period of dealing with buyers. A reported misnomer in cocoa marketing is the adjustment of the

weighing scales by buyers intended to cheat farmers. Older farmers through experience may be well informed so that they do not fall prey to these bad practices and this can influence their satisfaction with the price they receive for their produce. [20] however found a positive relationship between age and satisfaction rate of farmers in a "New Rural Farming Cooperative Medical System" in China.

The educational level of farmers exhibited a negative and highly significant relationship with satisfaction with pricing, implying that educated farmers were less satisfied with the price of cocoa compared to uneducated farmers. The marginal effect shows that the probability of satisfaction with the pricing of cocoa for educated farmers was 0.60 lower than for uneducated farmers. A possible explanation is that educated farmers are more likely to be enlightened and abreast with current information in the economy. Hence they are more likely to be able to analyse economic situations and decipher whether or not they are being well remunerate in their work. In addition, educated farmers have a greater opportunity cost of labour and therefore will anticipate better reward for their labour. The result differs from [22] who found a positive relationship between education and satisfaction of farmers with a Growth Enhancement Support Scheme in Nigeria.

**Table 4. Maximum likelihood estimates of the logit model of satisfaction with pricing**

Variable	Coefficient	P> z	Marginal effects
Age of farmer	0.065 (0.030)	0.029**	0.011
Educational status	-3.460 (1.029)	0.001***	-0.597
Sex of farmer	0.852 (1.167)	0.465	0.147
Farm size	-0.065 (0.058)	0.266	-0.011
Farm income	0.653 (0.325)	0.044**	0.113
Constant	-1.548 (1.803)	0.390	-
Number of observations	78		
Log likelihood	-40.5		
Wald chi2(5)	24.6		
Prob > chi2	0.00		
Pseudo R2	0.23		
Percentage correctly classified	73.1		

\*\*\* Statistical significance at 1% level. \*\* Statistical significance at 5% level. Figures in parentheses are standard errors

Farm income had a positive and significant relationship with satisfaction with cocoa pricing. Thus as farmers' level of income increases, satisfaction with pricing goes up. A unit increase in farm income increases the probability of satisfaction with cocoa pricing by 0.11. The result is expected because an increase in farm income is a motivation to most farmers and could be interpreted by many farmers to mean that the business of farming is going well. However farmers with low incomes could attribute their low returns to poor pricing of their commodity, hence lower satisfaction with pricing. Since most cocoa-producing households derive a major part of their livelihood from the crop, it implies that farmers who are satisfied with the price of cocoa are likely to be those in the high-income bracket. This means that satisfaction with the price of cocoa is related to economic status of the farmer. Income levels are very important to most smallholder farmers and tend to influence their perceptions and satisfaction with development programmes and policies. The result of this research is however at variance with [19] who found gross income to have a negative influence on farmers' satisfaction with an Agricultural Inputs Voucher system in China.

Farm size was negatively related to farmers' satisfaction with pricing of cocoa but was not a significant variable. Finally, gender of the farmer had a positive relationship with satisfaction and was not significant.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study was carried out to investigate the factors that determine farmers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa in Ghana. Cross-sectional data from cocoa farmers in the Bibiani-Anhwiaso-Bekwai District in the Western Region of Ghana was used for the study. A logit model was used to analyse the determinants of satisfaction with price. The study showed that two-thirds of the respondents were dissatisfied with the price they receive for their produce, indicating a general disenchantment with the pricing policy of the government. The result lends some credence to the call by liberalisation proponents for price liberalisation in Ghana's cocoa sector, particularly as it is argued that price liberalisation engenders price incentives to producers which will spur production. However, judging from the success story of the Ghanaian cocoa marketing system, as attested by many researchers, such a policy shift may not be helpful after all. What the government needs to do is to offer realistic prices

to farmers to motivate production of the crop considering the central role it plays in the socio-economic development of the country. The determinants of satisfaction with pricing were farmers' age, educational status and income from cocoa farming. Younger farmers expressed dissatisfaction with pricing which should be of concern to the government particularly as it seeks to encourage young people to venture into cocoa farming and agricultural production in general.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author acknowledges Kwame Adusei and Ebenezer Mintah for the data collection and data entry. Also acknowledged are the technical officers of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA) in the Bibiani-Anhwiaso-Bekwai District who provided assistance in selecting farmers for the survey.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Vigneri M. Drivers of cocoa production growth in Ghana. ODI Project Briefing No 4; 2007.
2. Vigneri M, Santos P. Ghana and the cocoa marketing dilemma: What has liberalization without price competition achieved? ODI Project Briefing, No 3; 2007.
3. Laven A. Marketing reforms in Ghana's cocoa sector. Partial liberalization, partial benefits? Amsterdam research institute metropolitan and international development studies. ODI Background Notes 4; 2007.
4. Bulil A. Can price incentive to smuggle explain the contraction of the cocoa supply in Ghana? J. Afr. Econ. 2003;11(3): 413-439.
5. Dormon ENA, Van-Huis A, Leeuwis C. Obeng-Ofori D, Sakyi-Dawson O. Causes of low productivity of cocoa in Ghana: Farmers' perspectives and insights from research and the socio-political establishment. NJAS Wageningen J. Life Sci. 2004;11(3/4):237-259.
6. Tutu K. Trade for sustainable development: The story of cocoa, gold and timber exports in Ghana. Roundtable discussion organized by the Institute of



- Economic Affairs (IEA), Accra. In: Bus & Financ Times. 2011;1209:1-3.
7. Breisinger C, Diao X, Kolavalli S, Thurlow J. The role of cocoa in Ghana's future development. Ghana Strategy Support Program (GSSP). Background paper no. GSSP 0011; 2008.
  8. Vigneri M, Santos P. What does liberalization without price competition achieve? The case of cocoa in Ghana. Contributed paper prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economists Conference. Beijing, China. 2009;16-22: 14-15.
  9. Varangis P, Schreiber G. Cocoa market reforms in West Africa. In: Akayima T, Baffes J, Larson D, Varangis P, (Eds.). Commodity market reforms: Lessons of two decades. The World Bank, Washington. D.C. 2001;2:35-82.
  10. Anang BT. Market structure and competition in the Ghanaian cocoa sector after partial liberalisation. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences. 2011;3(6):465-470.
  11. Anang BT, Adusei K, Mintah E. Farmers' assessment of benefits and constraints of Ghana's cocoa sector reform. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences. 2011;3(4):358-363.
  12. Barlett PF. Part-time farming: Saving the farm or saving the lifestyle? Rural Sociology. 1986;51(3):289-313.
  13. Coughenour CM, Tweeten L. Quality of life perceptions and farm structure. Chapter 6 in Joseph J. Molnar (ed.). Agricultural change. Boulder: Westview press; 1986.
  14. Garkovich L, Bokemeier JL. Factors associated with women's attitudes toward farming. Chapter 8 in Lionel J. Beaulieu (ed.). The rural south in ckk. Challenges for the future. Boulder: West view Press; 1988.
  15. Molnar Joseph J. Determinants of subjective well-being among farm operators: Characteristics of the individual and the firm. Rural Sociology. 1985;50(2): 141-162.
  16. Schroeder EH, Fliegel FC, Van Es JC. Measurement of the lifestyle dimensions of farming for small-scale farmers. Rural Sociology. 1985;50(3):305-322.
  17. Coughenour CM, Swanson L. Determinants of farmers' satisfactions with farming and with life: A replication and extension. Southern Rural Sociology. 1992;9(1):45-70.
  18. Loscocco K, Roschelle AR. Influences on the quality of work and nonwork life: Two decades in review. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 1991;39:182-225.
  19. Guo H, Jiang Y. Analysis on the influencing factors of farmers satisfaction to vouchers – Base on FAO Post-earthquake assistance program in Sichuan, China. Journal of Agricultural Science. 2011;3(3):211-216.
  20. Li J. An Analysis of the determinants of the satisfaction rate of the new rural farming cooperative medical system. Advance Journal of Food Science and Technology. 2014;6(7):900-905.
  21. Damisa MA, Abdulsalam Z, Kehinde A. Determinants of Farmers' satisfaction with their irrigation system in Nigeria. Trends in Agricultural Economics. 2008;1(1):8-13.
  22. Umar S, Oteikwu PO, Shuaibu H, Duniya PK, Tambari IW. Factors influencing level of satisfaction with growth enhancement support scheme among farm families in Kaduna state, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension. 2015;19(1):57-65.
  23. Collett D. Modelling binary data, London: Chapman and hall. Deininger K, Byerlee D; 2012. The rise of large farms in land abundant countries: Do they have a future? World Dev. 1991;40(4):701-714.
  24. Agresti A. Categorical data analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1990.
  25. Asamoah M, Baah F. Improving research – farmer linkages: The role of CRIG. A paper submitted at the 4th International Seminar on Cocoa-Pests and Diseases (INCOPED). Accra, Ghana; 2003.

© 2016 Anang; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/11896>