AN ASSESSMENT OF THE SUSTAINABILITY AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FAILURE Of AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION PROGRAMMES IN SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA

OZOANI, Sussan Ebele, OVWIGHO, Bishop O. and OFUOKU, Albert. U
Department of Agricultural Extension , Delta State University Abraka
Email: ebeleozoani78@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Agriculture occupies a cardinal role in the Nigerian economy judging by its significant role in provision of food, employment, raw materials and revenue generation**.** The broad objective of this study was to determine the sustainability and factors associated with the failure of selected agricultural development intervention programmes. The specific objectives were to: examine socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents, assess the sustainability of current and past programmes based on duration and continuity, assess the factors which lead to past programmes failure. A pre-research survey was conducted to determine the past and present agricultural development programmes in the South-east region. Purposive sampling was used to select three (3) states from the five (5) south-east states, namely; Anambra, Enugu and Imo States because of predominance of agricultural development intervention programme. All programme personnels, programme managers, directors, supervisors, extension agents and field staff constituted the study population of 215. The population of study consisted of programme personnels made up 62, 45 and 108 personnels from Anambra, Enugu and Imo States respectively. Data were collected from primary and secondary sources using questionnaire and policy documents of the programmes. The variables of the study were socio-economic characteristics, sustainability and factors associated to the programme failure. Socioeconomic characteristics attributes of respondents indicated that majority of the respondents had formal education. The analysis involved the use of inferential and descriptive statistics. Data were analysed by use of percentages, frequency counts, mean. Distribution of respondents based on sex composition were 99 (46.0%) males and 116 (54.0%) females. The results showed that more than 50% of the programme personnel were married. A combined total of 68.% of the respondents (programme personnel) had tertiary education. Most of programme personnel had 16.5years working experience. Prominent among factors that led to programme failure identified by respondents were; weak capacity of implementers (mean=3.22), short duration of programme (mean=3.06), poor planning and management (mean=3.02), development within the country and environmental challenges (mean= 3.03), weak inter ministerial synergy (2.98), weak of programme linkage with other sectors (mean=2.93) and poor interaction between and among stakeholders (mean=2.91), Five (5) current programmes were found to be sustainable. The study recommended the following measures to achieve sustainability of programmes to include: involvement of the local people in the entire project cycle, in-service training should be provided to implementers of the proogramme to upgrade them.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is an integral part of economic development in any country. In Nigeria, the agricultural sector has suffered so many challenges and reforms. Among the major challenges facing agriculture in Nigeria are climate change, drought, land degradation, violent conflicts and government policies towards agriculture. (Daneji, 2011) noted that the growth of the agricultural sector has declined drastically since independence with the contribution of agriculture to the national economy dropping from 80% in the 1960s to a mere 34% in 2003. Conscious of the strategic importance of agriculture in the economy, the Federal Republic of Nigeria have formulated and implemented various national agricultural programmes aimed at boosting agricultural production since independence.

An agricultural intervention programme is a plan by a country to support its agricultural development, and increase food production and welfare among smallholder farmers in collaboration with concerned stakeholders (Koyenikan, 2008). An agricultural intervention programme is a support for agricultural policy and regulatory frameworks to deliver on government expectations, and contributing to increasing food security.

A programme is a comprehensive plan that includes objectives to be attained, specification ofb resources required and stages of work to be performed Ozooani, (2017) sited Asiabaka, (2002)

The programmes formulated by the Federal Government of Nigeria include: Nigeria Agricultural Food Production Programme NAFPP (1966-1975) River Basin Development Authorities (RBDAs) 1976-1977, Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs) 1975, Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) 1976, The Green

Revolution Programme (GRP) 1979-1983, Back to Land 1983-1985, Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) 1983, National Fadama Development Project (NFDP) 1992, National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) 1992, National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) 1999, National Directorate for Employment (NDE) 1983, National Special programme on Food Security (NSPFS) 2003, Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP) 2003, Seven-Point Agenda (2015), Nigeria Agricultural Insurance Scheme (NAIS) 1987, Nigeria Cooperative bank now Bank of Agriculture (1973), Better Life Programme for Rural Women (BLSP) 1987-1992). Despite these numerous laudable agricultural programmes formulated, productivity has not improved (Oriola, 2009 and Ewetan et al, 2017).

Most of these agricultural intervention programmes are faced with series of challenges which hinder the fulfillment of purpose for which they are established.

The Federal Government of Nigeria has implemented a number of agricultural development programmes with extension components yet food production remains a mirage. Ovwigho (1985) opined that Operation Feed the Nation and Green Revolution Programmes initiated in 1975 and 1980 respectively could not achieve the desired goal of self-sufficiency in food production. The programmes were short--lived and lack cohesion, effective planning and execution. They were mismanaged by successive administrations. Adegbenbigbe (2004) stated that before the discovery of crude oil and military incursion into politics in 1966, the nation flourished on agriculture. Proceeds from cocoa, oil palm, rubber and groundnut produced at Western eastern, mid-west and northern regions respectively were used to build physical infrastructure and boost. He opined that instead of taking the discovery of crude oil as an additional source of income, agriculture and other natural resources were relegated to the background.

Inadequate and untimely funding of agriculture by the public sector coupled with inefficient and/or ineffective application of such funds (budgetary or otherwise) also constitute challenges to agricultural productivity and development. The Federal ministry of Agriculture and Rural development (FMARD, 2016) states that unstable policy framework, non-implementation of political commitment, persistent shortcoming in agricultural technology and extension, infrastructural deficit, poor finance and risk management, and un-streamlined institutional structures have been identified as some of the major problems against meaningful development of agriculture and an attempt to ameliorate these constraints by the Federal Government led to the adoption of the agricultural promotion policy (2016-2020)

Sustainability of agricultural programme means the ability of the programme to be carried out, maintained and be able to continue over a period of time by the government without depletion of natural or physical resources so that they will remain available for a long time.

Sustainability means meeting our own needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (UN, 2013). In addition to natural resources, we also need social and economic resources. Sustainability is not just environmentalism. Embedded in most definitions of sustainability we also find concerns for social equity and economic development. The motivations behind sustainability are often complex, personal and diverse. It is unrealistic to create a list of reasons why so many individuals, groups and communities are working towards this goal. Yet, for most people, sustainability comes down to the kind of future we are leaving for the next generation. According to the World Bank (1994) sustainability is requirement of our generation to manage the resource base such that the average equality of life that we ensure ourselves can potentially be shared by future generations. The notion 'quality of life' is meant to include everything that influences the situation in which people live.

The broad objective of the study was to investigate the sustainability and factors that lead to programmes failure in the study area. The specific objectives were to:

i describe the socio-economic characteristics of the programme personnels.

ii assess the sustainability of current and past programmes based on duration and continuity,

iii assess the factors which lead to past programme failure.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Study area

The study was conducted in South-East Gepolitical Zone, Nigeria. The area lies within latitude 5^0 20‘ and 7^0 75‘ North, and longitude 6^0 85‘ and 8^0 46‘East of equator and covers a land area of about 28,987 square kilometers, and an equivalent 3.19 per cent of the total land area of Nigeria. The Zone is made up of five states, namely, Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo States. The states in the zone share similar climatic characteristics (NPC, 2006). The zone covers the bulk of the Igbo-speaking ethnic territory or Igboland. The area lies mainly on plains under 200m above sea level. It is bounded on the south by Akwa Ibom and Rivers States, on the east by Cross River State, on the west by river Niger and Delta State, and on the north by Benue

State (Monanu, 2000; Anejionu, Nwilo and Ebinne, 2019).

Population, Sampling Techniques and Sampling size

Purposive sampling was used to select Anambra, Enugu and Imo States because of predominance of Agricultural development intervention programme. All programme personnels, programme managers, directors, supervisors, extension agents and field staff constituted the population.

Table 1 Population of the study

	States			
	Enugu	**Imo**	**Anambra**	
Programme Personnels	1	1	1	3
Programme managers	6	7	4	17
Directors	8	33	40	81
Programme Supervisors	30	67	62	114
Extension agents/ Field staff	45	108	62	215

The study was a population study which consist of programme personnels: Anambra (62), Enugu (45) and Imo (108) respectively. The populatiooon comprises officers of different agricultural development intervention programmes who have information regarding these intervention programmes and their sustainability.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected from primary and secondary sources. Primary source involved the use of questionnaire while secondary source include programme policy documents which was sourced and used by the officers in providing responses to the questionnaire on duration and continuity of the programmes. The level of sustainability was measured by a rating scale which consisted of 0-5 years (1), 6-10 years (2), above 10 years (3), ongoing (1), extinction (0), failed (0), succeeded (1). The face and content validity of the instrument was established. A prgramme with a mean score of 2 and above was regarded as sustainable while any mean score below 2 is regarded as unsustainable. Factors that lead to programme failure were measured by four point Likert type scale of Strongly Agreed=4, Agreed=3, Disagreed=2, Strongly Disagreed=1. Data collected were analysed by the use of mean from a rating scale and mean derived from four point Likert scale.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondents

Table1 Presented sex composition of the respondents were males 99 (46.0%) and females 116 (53.5%). The results indicated that the females were the dominant programme personnel in the south-east region compared to the males. This is a reflection of an imbalance in gender distribution of programme personnel in Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The imbalance in favour of female personnel agrees with studies by Okereke and Onu (2007), In their study they found that in positive contribution, more women farmers had access to information on improved farm technologies and basic production. Respondents who had SSCE/ WAEC were (20.3%), OND/ NCE (37.30%), B.Sc/ HND (34.0%), PGD (5.0%) and M.Sc (3.40). The combined proportion of the Ordinary National Diploma (OND)/ National Certificate of Education and B.Sc/ Higher National Diploma (HND) gave a total of 68.0%, an indication that most of the respondents (programme personnel) had tertiary education opportunities.

The percentage distribution of respondents based on experience were 1-3 years (19.5%), 4-6 years (17.7%), 7-9 years (16.8%), 10-12 years (20.5%), 13-15 years (9.8%), 16-18 years (6.1%), 19-21 years (7.4%), 22-24 years (.1%), 25-27 years (0%) and 28-30 years (4.7%). Most of programme personnels had the mean of 16.5years of experience. This is an indication that most of respondents have sufficient long on-the-job experience and would have acquired adequate knowledge for quality performance. Oladele (1999) stated the significance of long years of service is an indication of sufficient experience developed over time which could be transferred to subordinates in due course

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Socioeconomic characteristics

Variable	Frequency/Percentage		Mode/Mean
Sex			
Male	99	(46.0)	
Female	115	(54.0)	Female dominated
Total	215	(100)	
Educational level			
SSCE/WEAC	44	(20.3)	
OND/NCE	79	(37.30)	OND/NCE
B.Sc	73	(34.0)	
PGD	11	(5.0)	
M.Sc	8	(3.40)	
Total	215	(100)	
Experience (years)			
1-3	42	(19.4)	
4-6	38	(17.7)	
7-9	35	(15.8)	
10-12	37	(20.5)	16.5Years
13-15	21	(9.8)	
16-18	12	(5.0)	
19-21	16	(7)	
22-24	2	(.1)	
25-27	2	(-)	
28-30	10	(4.7)	
	215	(100)	

Sustainability of Current Programmes by Duration and Continuity

From the Table 3, the following programmes were found to be sustainable with these mean scores: Agricultural Development Programme (mean=3.04), Root, Tuber and Expansion Programme (mean=3.24), National Directorate of Employment (mean=2.61), National Fadama Development Programme (mean=2.30), and Nigeria Agricultural Insurance Scheme (2.66)

Table 3 Sustainability of Current Programme by Duration and Continuity

Programme	Mean	SD	Remark
ADP	3.04	1.31	Sustainable
RTEP	3.24	1.34	Sustainable
NDE	2.61	1.91	Sustainable
NFDP	2.30	1.23	Sustainable
NAIS	2.66	1.25	Sustainable

Five prgammes were sustainable with mean score of 2.00 and above as a decision rule.

Sustainability of Past Programmes by Duration and Continuity

Table 4 showed the responses on the programmes that were found to be unsustainable with these mean scores: National Accelerated Food Production Programme (mean=0.66), Green Revolution (mean=0.28), Directorate for Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (mean=0.39), BLSP (mean=0.65) and National Agricultural Land Development Authority (mean=0.24)

Table 4 Sustainability of Past Programmes by Duration and Continuity

Programme	Mean	SD	Remark
NAFPP	0.66	0.47	Unsustainable
GRP	0.28	0.45	Unsustainable
DFRRI	0.39	0.49	Unsustainable

BLSP	0.65	0.47	Unsustainable
NALDA	0.24	0.43	Unsustainable

Five unsustainable programme with mean score below 2.00 as the decision rule.

Factors Which Lead to Programme Failure

Table 5 indicated that the respondents agreed to the 15 item factors which led to programme failure. These factors include: poor interaction between and among stakeholders (M=2.91), role conflicts between different programmes (mean=2.79), short duration of programmes (Mean=3.06), non duration of programme (mean=2.7), theft of produce (mean=2.82), inadequate fund/ corruption (mean=2.67), inadequate technical advisory / extension services (Mean=2.48), that lack/ inadequate monitoring and evaluation of programme /projects (2.58), poor planning and management (mean=3.02), majority of the participants had little or no farming background (Mean=2.74), bureaucratic bottleneck (mean=2.79), weak linkage of programme with other sectors (mean=2.93), poor capacity of implementers (mean 3.22), weak inter ministerial synergy (mean=2.98) and development within the country and environmental challenges (flooding, diseases and pests) Mean=3.03).

Anyebe (2016) identified corruption, policy distortions, inadequate funding and managerial deficiency as challenges to programme success. Elenbass (2000) and Namakhoma (2015) also argued that programmes fail because vital aspects of programme are usually ignored during proramme initiation, preparation, planning and designing, implementation and follow-up.

Table 5 Factors that lead to programme failure

S/N	Statement	Mean	Std	Remark
1	Poor interaction between and among stakeholders	2.91	1,08	Agreed
2	Role conflict between different programmes	2.79	1.05	Agreed
3	Short duration of programme	3.06	1.04	Agreed
4	Non duration of programme	2.75	1.03	Agreed
5	Theft of produce	2.82	1.11	Agreed
6	Inadequate Fund/Corruption	2.67	1.12	Agreed
7	Inadequate technical advisory and extension services	2.48	1.13	Agreed
8	Lack/ Inadequate monitoring and evaluation of programme/ projects	2.58	1.16	Agreed
9	Poor planning and management	3.02	1.02	Agreed
10	Little or no farming experience	2.74	1,04	Agreed
11	Bureacratic bottleness	2.79	1.4	Agreed
12	Weak linkage of programme with other sectors	2.93	0,99	Agreed
13	Poor capacity of implementers	3.22	0.84	Agreed
14	Weak inter ministerial synergy	2.98	0.94	Agreed
15	Environmental challenges (flooding, diseases and pests	3.03	0.91	Agreed
	Grand Mean	2.86		

Likert type scale coding: Strongly Agreed=4, Ageed=3, Disagreed=2, Strongly Disagreed=1

Conclusions

10 selected Agricultural Development Intervention Programmes were identified and their Sustainability. Socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents were observed.

The current and past programmes were assessed by programme being sustainable and unsustainable.

Sustainability of the programmes were assessed by programme duration and continuity.

Several factors were found to led to programme failure. There is a positive correlation between the failure of the past programme and success of the current programmes.

References

Adebisi, T. A., Oni. (2012), Assessment of Relevance of the National Directorate of Employment (NDE) training programmes to the Needs of Trainees in Southwestern Nigeria. International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 4(3), 29-37gbe

Adegbenenbi, (2004)

Afolayan, S. O. (1997), Effects of Irrigation Frequency on soil moisture potential and Fruit yield of Okra (Abelmoschuss esculentus. Paper presented at the 15th annual conference of HORTSON held at NHORH, Ibadan: April 8-11, 1997.

Agriscope, (2001), Newsletter of the project coordinating units, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Anyebe, A. A. (2016) An Overview of National Directorate of Employment (NDE) and its Mandate in Nigeria Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies 1(2):51-55

Amira and Ngwama (2015)

Daneji M. I. (2011), Agricultural Development Intervention Programme in Nigeria (1960 To Date) A Review. Savannah Journal of Agriculture, Volume 6 (1).

Elenbass, B. (2000). "Staging a Project – Are You Setting Your Project Up for Success?", Proceedings of the Project Management Institute Annual Seminars & Symposiums, September 7 – 16, 2000, Houston, TX

Ewetan et al 2017

Koyenikan, (2008) Issues for Agricultural Extension Policy in Nigeria.

Monanu 2000, Anejionu, Nwilo , Ebinne (2019)

Namakhoma, P. D. (2015) An Investigation Into Why Projects Fail In Agriculture, A Case Study Of Horticulture And Food Crops Development Project (HFCDP) In The Central Region Of Malawi Unpublished M.Sc Thesis University of Bolton

NPC, (2006), Nigeria National Census: Population Distribution by Sex, State, LGAS and Senatorial District.

Okereke, N, and D.O. Oni (2007) Effect of socioeconomic charecteristics of field extension workers on their job performance in Imo State, Nigeria Journal of Agricultural Extension and Social Research 7(2): 79-88

, Oriola E.O. (2009) Aframework for Food security and poverty reduction in Nigeria, European Journal of Social Sceinces- (8) 1

Ovwigho B.O, (199985) Problems of Agricultural Programmes : The Nigeria Observer Thursday January 31, 1985 p :7

Ozoani S.E, (2019) Appraisal of Agricultural Programmes in Nigeria. International Journal of Innovative Agriculture and Biology Research 7(1)Shimada (1999)

World Bank, (1994) Report Infrastructure for Development