



CROP FARMERS' PERCEPTION OF GROWTH ENHANCEMENT SCHEME IN CURBING CORRUPTION IN INORGANIC FERTILISER DELIVERY IN ODEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OGUN STATE NIGERIA

¹Oyetoro, J. O., ¹Rahman, S. B., ¹Oladipo, S. O. and ²Jolayemi, J. O.

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, LAUTECH, Ogbomosho

²Department of Agricultural Education, Kwara State College of Education, Oro

E-mail: jooyetoro@lautech.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

The study investigate crop farmers' perception of Growth Enhancement Scheme (GES) in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery in Odeda Local Government Area of Ogun State Nigeria. Two-stage sampling technique was used to select the 117 GES crop farmers and data was obtained with the aid of structured interview schedule. Data was analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, means and t-test analysis. Findings of the study revealed that mean age of the respondents was 51.9 years and the mean years of farming experience was 29.2 years. The study also discovered that 62.4% of the respondents claimed to be facing serious problem on cumbersome procedure in accessing fertiliser. The study also revealed that respondents developed negative perception towards the following statements: "A token needs to be paid for easy registration of GES"; "None registered farmers can also manoeuvre their way to get fertiliser"; "At fertiliser redemption centre, it is whom you know to get fertiliser"; "Bad GSM network connectivity does not impaired redemption of fertiliser" and "the price of GES fertiliser was not the same in the same locality". Furthermore, no significant differences existed ($t= 0.948$, $p= 0.976$) in the perceptual status index of male and female respondents of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery. The study concluded that respondents perceived GES as being effective in curbing corruption in fertiliser delivery and therefore recommends that efforts should be made to ensure timely delivery of inorganic fertiliser by the GES stakeholders and sensitize people more about the scheme.

Key words: Farmers' Perception, Growth Enhancement Scheme (GES), Corruption, Fertiliser delivery.

INTRODUCTION

The Growth Enhancement Support Scheme (GESS) was designed as a component of the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) of the Federal Government. The ATA is the Government's response to the crisis that has riddled the agricultural sector in the past and seeks to put agricultural growth at the centre of the Government's development objective given its critical role for food security and economic diversification. At inception, the broad objective of the GESS was to achieve food security for the nation at the macro level, and increase household income for the farmers at the micro level. The scheme was designed to encourage the stakeholders in the fertiliser value chain to work together to improve productivity, household food security and raise the income of the farmer by providing direct subsidy through the supply of discounted fertilisers and seeds. In the past, fertiliser procurement and distribution in the country has been fraught with fraud, discrepancies and inefficiencies. Governments at the Federal and State levels were spending a lot of money on farm inputs which were not reaching the intended beneficiaries (small holder farmers) and thus, had no impact on the national food output. The Federal Government was involved in the direct procurement and distribution of fertilisers and this weakened the ability of private companies to participate in the sector and compete efficiently for market share. As with most subsidy regimes, the sector was grossly under developed and the opportunities for corruption

were rampant (Fertiliser Producers and Suppliers Association of Nigeria (FEPSAN), 2012).

Several scholars have defined corruption in many ways. World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (2006) described corruption as the abuse of office for private gains. Public office is abused for private gain when an official accepts, solicits, or extorts a bribe. Azelama (2002) observed corruption as any action or omission enacted by a member of an organisation, which is against the rules, regulations, norms, and ethics of the organisation and the purpose is to meet the selfish end of the member at the detriment of the organisation. Waziri (2010) considered corruption as a pervasion or a change from the generally accepted law or rules for personal benefit. Over the years, the distribution of fertilisers has remained a racketeering business for some group of persons. Farmers have had to lament the poor handling and management of the fertiliser distribution because past governments failed to nip the racketeering in the bud. The ex-minister of Agriculture and Rural Development (Dr. Akinwumi Adesina) lamented that between 1980 and 2010, the Federal and State governments spent over N873 billion on fertiliser subsidies and out of this amount, Nigeria lost N776 billion to corruption and fertiliser racketeering within this period (Ajayi, 2015).

Available field information showed that further progress has been recorded in the area of input supply, production and other levels along the value chain. Although varied challenges were reported from participating farmers in states with GES



implementation. For instance, 65%-70% of registered farmers accessed fertilisers/certified seeds, while 118,639 bundles of cassava cuttings were also distributed to farmers. A total of 6,053,211.40 Metric Tonnes of fertiliser was procured and distributed directly to farmers at redemption centres across the nation with no middleman. Also, the National Agricultural Seed Council indicated that the use of improved seeds increased from 14% in 2012 to 23.5% in 2013 and registered seed companies increased from 30 in 2012 to 75 in 2013. These have had direct positive impacts on field crop performance, output, employment generation and income of farmers. It is estimated that 3.26 million jobs had been created by ATA along the target value chain commodities. The identified challenges of GES were: untimely supply of input, inadequate resources and equipment to clear large expanse of lands for cultivation, inadequate extension workers, lack of direct financing of every value chain funding at the Green House level, untimely commencement of GES activities, inadequate sensitization and enlightenment of field actors, bad GSM network connectivity, particularly in rural areas, which impaired redemption; few redemption centres; hence, farmers moved long distances to redeem their inputs; lack of credit facilities to support poor farmers and high cost of credit to commercial farmers and lack of irrigation facilities for dry season farming or for supplementary irrigation during protracted dry spells. (National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS) and Federal Department of Agricultural Extension (FDAE) (2013). The study is set to ascertain the selected socioeconomic characteristics of respondents; determines the constraints facing respondents in accessing inorganic fertiliser and determines respondents' perception of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Odeda Local Government Area of Ogun state, Nigeria. It's headquarter is at Odeda, a place situated along Abeokuta- Ibadan Road, which is about 10 kilometers from Abeokuta (the State Capital). The headquarters of the Local Government Area is on the A5 highway $7^{\circ}13'00''N$ $3^{\circ}31'00''E$. It has an area of 1,560 km² and a population of 109,449 peoples at the 2006 census. It has an extensive landmass mostly grass. The vegetation of the Local Government is mainly Orchard and of thick grasses. Thus, the land is suitable for crop production and livestock rearing (Wikipedia, 2014). The local government has 10wards. Two-stages sampling technique was used to select the respondents. The first stage involved random selection of 4 wards which are: Alabata, Obantoko,

Odeda and Osiele. The second stage involved random selection of 10% of crop farmers' beneficiaries of GES. Thus, 11 respondents were selected from Alabata, 55 from Obantoko, 29 from Odeda and 22 from Osiele to give a sample size of 117 respondents. The dependent variable is the perceptual status of the respondents, 10 perceptual statements were asked the respondents and response were scored on 5 point Likert scale of strongly agreed- 5, agreed- 4, undecided- 3, disagreed -2, strongly disagreed -1. The scoring were reversed for negative statements. The independent variables consists of the selected socioeconomics characteristics of respondents. Descriptive statistical tools used were frequency counts and percentages while t-test analysis was used to establish the significant difference between the perceptual status of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery of male and female respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic characteristics of respondents

Data presented in Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents according to their socioeconomic characteristics. The mean age of the respondents was 51.9 years. This means that respondents were in their middle ages having strength and vigour to cope with rigour involved in crop production activities. The result support the findings of Oyetoro (2014) that crop farmers in South Western Nigeria are becoming of age as many in farming are in their 50's. The study also revealed that most of the respondents (67.5%) were male. The mean years of farming experience was 29.2 years. This implies that respondents in the study area have farmed for sufficient years to develop enormous knowledge on crop production activities. Also, the mean farm size is 2.6hectares. According to Food and Agriculture Organisation (2010), farm size of less than 5hectares is classified to be small scale farming.

Table1: Distribution of respondents according to their selected socioeconomic characteristics, n=117

Socioeconomic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Age (years)			
Less than 30	5	4.3	
31-50	56	47.9	
51-70	52	44.4	51.9
71 and above	4	3.4	
Sex			
Male	79	67.5	
Female	38	32.5	
Marital status			
Single	3	2.6	
Widow/widower	12	10.2	
Divorced	3	2.6	



Socioeconomic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Married	99	84.6	
Years of farming experience (years)			
≤ 5	1	0.9	
6-10	7	6.0	29.2
11 years and above	109	93.1	
Farm size (hectares)			
≤ 3	68	58.1	2.6
4-10	38	32.5	
11 and above	11	9.4	

Source: field survey, 2015.

Constraints facing respondents in accessing inorganic fertiliser

Data in Table 2 revealed that high fertiliser price is a serious problem to 51.3% of the respondents. This finding corroborated the report of FEPSAN (2012) that most GES farmers are facing challenge of high fertiliser price. It should be noted that respondents paid 50% of the cost of fertiliser while federal and state governments bear the remaining cost of 50%. This means that some farmers cannot still afford the subsidised fertiliser price. Also, 62.4% of the respondents are facing serious problem on cumbersome procedure in accessing fertiliser, only 38.5% of the respondents claimed serious problem of not meeting up with the required quantity of fertiliser. This means that most of the respondents are contented with quantity of fertiliser received through GES. Also, 42.7% of the respondents claimed serious problem of availability of lower quantity of fertiliser (such as half bag-25kg). It means that most respondents operates on small scale basis and may not be able to afford 50kg fertiliser bag. All the respondents claimed that getting the needed type of fertiliser is not a problem. However, majority (76.1%) of the respondents claimed that late delivery of fertilisers to farmers was a serious problem. This means that supply of fertilisers to farmers through GES may not meet planting season which can affect crop production in the study area.

Table2: Distribution of respondents according to constraints facing them in accessing inorganic fertiliser

Constraints*	Serious	Mild	Not a problem
High Fertiliser price	60(51.3)	30(25.6)	27(23.1)

Constraints*	Serious	Mild	Not a problem
Cumbersome procedure in accessing fertiliser	73(62.4)	20(17.1)	24(20.5)
Quantity required is not met	45(38.5)	10(8.5)	62(53.0)
Lower quantity such as half bag (25kg) not available	50(42.7)	10(8.5)	57(48.8)
Problem of getting the needed type of fertiliser	0 (0.0)	10(8.5)	107(91.5)
Late delivery of fertilisers to farmers	89(76.1)	20(17.1)	8(6.8)

Source: Field survey, 2015.

Figures in parentheses are percentages

* Multiple responses

Crop farmers' perception of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery

The statements whose weighted mean values are equal to or greater than the grand mean (2.56) are classified to have positive perception by the respondents while the mean values less than the grand mean are classified to have negative perception by the respondents. Hence, respondents developed positive perception towards the following statements: Only progressive farmers obtained information /alert on their e-wallet system; procurement of fertiliser through GES was not usually timely for crop production and through GES, the needed bags of inorganic fertiliser cannot be met. However, respondents developed negative perception towards the following statements: a token needs to be paid for easy registration of GES; none registered farmers can also manoeuvre their way to get fertiliser; at fertiliser redemption centre, it is whom you know to get fertiliser; bad GSM network connectivity does not impair redemption of fertiliser; obtaining fertiliser type demanded was not easy at point of collection and the price of GES fertiliser was not the same in the same locality. Developing negative perception towards the statements above implies that respondents perceived GES as being effective in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery.



Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to their perception of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery

Perception statements*	Strongly agreed	Agreed	Undecided	Disagreed	Strongly disagreed	Mean
Abnormal cash payments usually made before procurement of fertiliser	0 (0.0)	8(6.8)	16(13.7)	81(69.2)	12(10.3)	3.86
A token needs to be paid for easy registration of GES	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	32(27.4)	51(43.6)	32(27.4)	2.16
None registered farmers can also manoeuvre their way to get fertiliser	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	21(17.9)	63(53.8)	33(28.2)	2.26
Only progressive farmers got information /alert on their e-wallet system	4(3.4)	14(12.0)	0 (0.0)	21(17.9)	78(66.7)	3.13
At fertiliser redemption centre, it is whom you know to get fertiliser	0 (0.0)	1(0.9)	13(11.1)	59(50.4)	44(37.6)	1.75
Procurement of fertiliser through GES was not usually timely for crop production	60(51.3)	34(29.1)	3(2.6)	19(16.2)	1(0.9)	2.58
Bad GSM network connectivity does not impaired redemption of fertiliser	22(18.8)	16(13.7)	0 (0.0)	38(32.5)	41(35.0)	2.44
Obtaining fertiliser type demanded was not easy at point of collection	0 (0.0)	4(3.4)	24(20.5)	32(27.4)	57(48.7)	1.56
Through GES, the needed bags inorganic fertiliser cannot be met	105(89.8)	2(1.7)	0 (0.0)	7(5.9)	3(2.6)	1.72
The price of GES fertiliser was not the same in the same locality	3(2.6)	3(2.6)	8(6.8)	48(41.0)	55(47.0)	2.30
Grand Total						2.56

Source: Field survey, 2015.

Figures in parentheses are percentages

* Multiple responses

Paired Sample t-test Analysis of the Difference between the Perceptual Status Index of Male and Female Respondents on GES in Curbing Corruption in Inorganic Fertiliser Delivery.

Data in Table 4 shows no significant differences ($t=0.948$, $p=0.976$) in the perceptual status index of male and female respondents of GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery. This means that gender has no influence on the perception of both male and female respondents on GES in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery.

Table 4: Paired sample t test analysis of the difference between the perceptual status index of male and female respondents on GES in curbing corruption in fertiliser delivery

Variables	t-value	p-value	Decision
Perceptual status index of male and female respondents	22.42	0.976	Not significant
	14.06		

Source: Field survey (2015)

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that respondents perceived GES as being effective in curbing corruption in inorganic fertiliser delivery. The study recommends that

efforts should be made to ensure timely delivery of inorganic fertiliser. Also procedure to access fertiliser should be less cumbersome to encourage more participants for the programme to maximally achieve the goals set for it.

REFERENCES

- Ajayi, O. (2015): The Goodluck Jonathan Agriculture Revolution, Vanguard Newspaper. Available online <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/02/goodluck-jonathan-agriculture-revolution/> Accessed on 20th June, 2015
- Azelama J.U (2002): Public Enterprise Management in Nigeria, Ambik Press, Benin-City, Nigeria
- Fertiliser Producers and Suppliers Association of Nigeria (FEPSAN, 2012): The Growth Enhancement Support Scheme (GESS) Monitoring Report.
- Food and Agriculture Organisation (2014): Characterization of small farmers in Asia and the Pacific, Rome, Italy. URL <http://www.fepsannigeria.com/files/GESS%20Monitoring%20Report%20FC%20Revised%20%20Final.pdf>
- National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS) and Federal Department of Agricultural Extension (FDAE) (2013): Agricultural Performance



- Survey Report of 2013 Wet Season in Nigeria, Ahmadu Bello University, NAERLS Press, Zaria.
- Oyetoro J.O (2014): Assessment of Contribution of University Based Extension Projects to Arable Crop Production in South West Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.
- Waziri, F. (2010): Corruption and Governance Challenges, Nigeria Conference Proceedings, Monograph Series Number 7, Cleen Foundation, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Wikipedia (2014): Odeda location in Nigeria. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/odeda>
- World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (2006): Engaging With Fragile States: An IEG Review of World Bank Support To Low-Income Countries Under Stress, The World Bank, Washington Dc. www.worldbank.org/ieg