EFFECT OF USAID MARKET II PROGRAMME ON THE FOOD SECURITY STATUS OF BENEFICIARY FARMERS IN AKWA IBOM STATE SOUTH-SOUTH, NIGERIA

Miriam Chiazokam CHUKWU¹, Chioma Udo NWAOBIALA², Justin Nnaemeka OHAGWAM³

¹National Root Crops Research Institute Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria, Ginger Research Programme, Phone:+234816637252, E-mail: chiazochukwu@gmail.com

²Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria, Phone: +2348061636932, E-mail: cunwaobiala@gmail.com

³Imo State Polytechnic Omuma, Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Imo State, Nigeria, Phone:+2347034382387, E-mail: nnaemekajustin83@gmail.com

Corresponding author: cunwaobiala@gmail.com

Abstract

Over the years, various agricultural programmes and policies that are both public and private sector driven has been developed, focusing more on increasing farm production with little or no emphasis on the food security status of farmers. The study determined the effect of USAID/MARKETS II Programme on the food security status of farmers in Akwa Ibom State, south-south Nigeria and was analyzed 2020. Specifically the determined the food security status, index and compared the differences in the food security status of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers. It adopted both purposive and multi-stage random sampling procedures to select one hundred and eighty (180) respondents made up of 90 programme beneficiary and 90 non-beneficiary farmers). The study made use of structured questionnaire to collect data and were subjected to analysis using food security index and Z-test analyses). Food security status result showed that the mean per capita household expenditure per month for programme beneficiary farmers was N21,120.46(69.02USD) as against the non-programme beneficiary farmers with N5,474.41(17.89 USD). More so, the food security index, showed that a moderate proportion of programme beneficiary farmers were food secured (43.33%) than non-programme beneficiary farmers (33.33%). The study concluded that the programme has impacted on the beneficiary farmers by increasing their food security status. Policies aimed at replicating the programme in other rural communities and encouraging farmers to engage in foreign sponsored programmes is thereby advocated in order to guarantee household food security.

Key words: effect, USAID MARKET II, programme, food security, beneficiary, farmers

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Government of Nigeria has undertaken series of measures and policies over the years to use agriculture as a strategy to alleviate poverty and attain food security among rural households. Food security is an essential determinant for any population to be healthy and well -nourished [8]. In Nigeria, more than 82.9 million of its population lived below poverty line of \$\frac{\text{N137,430}}{137,430}\$ per year, whereas 40.1 per cent of the country's populations live in abject poverty as affirmed by National Bureau of Statistics, (NBS) [10], [1]. Food security is said to manifest when people always have both physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and

nutritious food to meet their dietary needs for a healthy life [7], [4]. It also referred to as the availability and affordability of food which is an indication of effective agricultural development policy in most developing countries. Though Nigeria claims to be the largest economy in Africa, the food insecurity rate in the country is worrisome, as not less than 70% of the populations are food insecure surviving on less than a dollar per day [18].

The World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), National FADAMA Development Project (NFDP) and among others are foreign agencies and international

organizations are development collaborators with the Federal and State governments of Nigeria with the mandate to ensuring rural households were food secure through their promoted programmes. This intervention resulted to engagement of stakeholders in projects targeted towards having significant impact on the food security and livelihoods of the country's population [13][12]. [6] reported that household food security is comprehensive as it integrates food stability, access and availability of adequate food for the populace to utilize judiciously. Studies has shown that most of the World food insecure countries are in Africa which is characterized by the prevalence of poverty, hunger, malnutrition, famine and high population growth rate [19], [9].

In order to ameliorate food insecurity among rural households in Nigeria, The Maximizing Agricultural Revenue and Key Enterprise in Targeted Sites (MARKETS USAID/Nigeria's flagship project under their Future (FTF) Agricultural Feed the Transformation **Program** (ATP) introduced to enhance the performance, incomes, nutrition and food security of poor smallholders rural farmers or environmentally appropriate manner through proven private sector demand-driven market interventions and programme support services; This initiative has helped about 3.6 million beneficiary farmers to gain access to new technologies of which Akwa Ibom State benefited [18].

In view of the above assertion, it is not certain whether the programme has increased the food security of its beneficiaries. It is against this backdrop that this study was undertaken to determine the food security status of beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers of the programme in Akwa Ibom State, south-south Nigeria.

Specifically this research:

- (i) analyzed the food security statues of programme beneficiary and non- beneficiary farmers
- (ii) ascertained the food security index of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers; and

(iii) compared the differences between the food security statuses of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers in the study area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Area of Study

The area of study is Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria south-south Nigeria. The State lies between Latitude 4⁰33N', 5⁰35N' of the Equator and Longitude 7^o35E', 8^o25E' of the Greenwich Meridian. It shares border on the east by Cross Rivers State, the west by Rivers State as against Abia State, and the south by the Atlantic Ocean. Akwa Ibom State occupies a total landmass of 7,246 square kilometers, and is blessed with natural resources abound in agriculture, forestry, solid minerals, crude oil and gas. It has a population of 5,482,200 people and 3.5% annual population growth rate of 191,877 people [11]. The climate is tropical rain forest marked by two distinct seasons, the dry (November, April) and the wet (May-October) seasons. It has an average annual 2.500mm-3.000mmm of temperature of between 20°C to 30°C with mean Relative Humidity of 80.0%. The soil found in the area is generally fertile sandy loam which favours the cultivation of many arable and cash crops such as maize, cassava, oil palm, rubber and cocoa [2].

Sample Size and Data Analysis

The study adopted purposive and multistage random sampling procedures. Purposively, one Local Government Area/programme area each were randomly selected from the agricultural zones of the State namely; Uyo, Eket, Oron, Ikot Ekpene, Etinan and Abak, because the intensity of their engagement in programme activities. Randomly, multistage sampling procedure was used to select two (2) communities each from the six (6) Local Government Areas; Uyo, Effat Offot and Aka Offot were selected; Eket-Afaha Eketand Okon Eket; **Oron** – Eyo Abasi District and Uya Oro District; Ikot Ekpene – Ikot Abia Idem and -Ikot Osura; Etinan -Ekpene Obom and Ikot Ekan and Abak-Utu Edem Urua and Oku Abak, which gave a total

186

of twelve (12) participating communities. In the second stage two (2) farmer groups were randomly selected to give a total of twenty four (24) farmer groups. In the third stage, four (4) beneficiary farmers of the programme each were randomly selected to which gave a sample size of ninety six (96) programme beneficiary farmers.

The non-programme beneficiary farmers were also selected from the areas where the

participating farmers were selected and this gave a grand sample size of one and ninety two (192) farmers (96 for programme beneficiary and 96 for non-beneficiary farmers). A total of 192 questionnaires were administered but 180 were returned, making the grand sample size of 180 (90 programme beneficiary farmers and 90 non-programme beneficiary farmers) that was finally used for the study.



Map 1. Map Showing the Local Government Areas of Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria Source. Google (2020). Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria [Google Maps]. www.akwaibomstate.org,ng [20].

Measurement of Variable

The food security index model was used to determine the food security status of programme beneficiary and non-programme beneficiary farmers. The food security index was employed to classify the households that were food secure and food insecure which is expressed thus:

$$Fi = \frac{per\ capital\ food\ expenditure\ for\ ith\ household}{\frac{2}{3}mean\ per\ capital\ food\ expenditure\ of\ all\ households}.....(1)$$

As implied, Fi = Food security index. If Fi > 1= Food secure ith household if< 1= Food insecure ith household.

The model infers that households whose per capita monthly food expenditure are above or is equal to two thirds of the mean per capita are food secure and otherwise, food insecure. The headcount ratio (H) of food security was calculated based on the percentage of the population of households that are food secure/insecure. The headcount index formula is given by:

Headcount index (H) = M/N(2)

where:

M = number of food secure/insecure households

N = the number of households in the sample

Model Specification

The Z-test analysis was adopted to compare the mean differences between food security status of programme beneficiary and nonbeneficiary farmers

The model is specified thus:

$$Z = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}...(3)$$

 $n_1 + n_2 - 2$ degrees of freedom

Where,

Z = Z Statistic

 \overline{X}_1 = sample mean of programme beneficiary farmers' food security status

 \overline{X}_2 = sample mean of non-programme beneficiary farmers' food security status σ^2_1 = non-programme beneficiary farmers' standard deviation

 σ^2_2 = non-programme beneficiary farmers' standard deviation

 n_1 = programme beneficiary farmers' sample size

 n_2 = non – programme beneficiary farmers' sample size

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Food Security Status of Programme Beneficiary and Non-Beneficiary Farmers

The result showed the food security status of programme of both farmer groups (Table 1).

The result indicates that the mean income for programme beneficiary farmers was ₩233,855.60 (764.23 USD), non-programme beneficiary farmers (N192,986.70 630.67USD), expenditure N193,555.60(632.53USD) (programme N38,923.33 beneficiary farmers) and (127.20USD) (non-programme beneficiary) with household sizes of 6.54 and 5.87 persons beneficiary for programme and programme beneficiary farmers respectively. Using two-third of the mean per capita household expenditure following [17], the ₩5,474.41 (17.89USD) as a food security line (bench mark) for programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers respectively.

The study revealed that a good proportion (56.67%) and most (66.67%) of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers as food insecure respectively while a moderate (43.33%) of beneficiary and 33.33% of non-beneficiary farmers were food secure. The result implied that the mean per capita household expenditure per month beneficiary programme farmers was ₩21,120.46, (69.02 USD) which was higher non-beneficiary than the farmers (N5,474.41(17.89USD) amounting to ofN704.02 equivalent (2.30USD) and N182.48,(60 daily expenditure cents) respectively.

The result is corroborates with the previous studies of [5], as they observed ₹7,967.57 (26.03USD) as monthly mean capita expenditure which translate to ₹265.57 (87 cents) per day while [16], [17] estimated ₹75.71, (25 cents) as daily mean capita expenditure for rural households in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of food security statues of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers

Farmers	Beneficiary farmers			Non-beneficiary farmers		
Variables	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Income	233,855.60	77,000	400,000	192,986.70	39,000	850,000
Expenditure	193,555.60	70,000	350,000	38,923.33	10,000	170,000
Household size	6.5	3	10	5.8	1	13
Food security	21,120.46	6,533	46,66.67	5,474.41	666.67	33,333.33

Source: Author's estimated based on Field Survey, 2020.

Note 1. United States Dollar exchanged for 306 Nigerian Naira (NGN) during the research.

Food Security Index of Programme Beneficiary and Non- Beneficiary Farmers

The result of food security index of beneficiary and non-beneficiary is shown in Table 2. There was a lower percentage of food secured farmers for both farmers in the study area as compared to greater percentage of those that were food insecure. There was more percentage of food secure farmers for programme beneficiaries than that of the non-programme farmers. This is an indication of effect of USAID programme in improving the

livelihood of the farmers particularly on increased expenditure. This result further portrays that the USAID farmers were moderately food insecure since the number of food insecure (56.67%) were slightly greater than food secure (43.33%) compared to non-programme beneficiary farmers that were likely food insecure (66.67%) with greater percentage than food secure (33.33%). This finding is consistent with that of [14], [15] as they reported that two third of farming rural households in Nigeria were not food secure.

Table 2. Frequency distribution of food security index of programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers

	Beneficiary Farmers		Non- beneficiary farmers	
Food security index	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Food secure	51	56.67	60	66.67
Food insecure	39	43.33	30	33.33

Source: Field Survey Data, 2020.

Comparison between Food Security Statues of Progarmme Beneficiary and Non-Beneficiary Farmers

The result of comparison of the differences between food security index for programme beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers is presented in Table 3. The result revealed that mean food security index for both farmer groups were 21,120.46 (programme

beneficiary farmers) and 5,474.441 (non-beneficiary farmers). The difference in mean between the two groups of farmers was 15,646.02 with a standard deviation of 13,665.68. The result shows that the calculated "Z" was 16.42, which is higher than the tabulated "Z" of 2.58 was highly significant at 1.0% level of probability.

Table 3. Z-test comparison of the differences between food security statues of beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers in the study area.

farmers	in	the	study	area

		Standard		
Variables	Mean	Deviation	F-calculated	F-tabulated
Beneficiary farmers	21,120.46	7,474.4920		
Non-beneficiary farmers	5474.441	5083.9030		
Combined	13297.45	10107.93		
Difference	15,646.02	13,765.68	16.42***	2.58

Source: Field survey, 2020

*** $p \le 0.01$

Note: 1. United States Dollar exchanged for 306 Nigerian Naira (NGN) during the research.

This finding is in consonance with the findings of [10], [3] as they found that there was an increased availability and access to food in rural areas of Nigeria which was as a result of the intervention of rural development programme.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that the programme has effect on the food security status beneficiary farmers. It is therefore recommended that the programme should be replicated in other rural communities and policies aimed at encouraging farmers to engage in foreign and donor sponsored programmes is advocated for increased household food security.

REFERENCES

[1]Akpan, S.B., Patrick, I.V., Essien, C.A., 2014, The attainment of the United Nation Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) number two: assessment of some indicators in Nigeria. Scientific Papers Series

Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development, Vol. 24 (1), 25 – 38.

[2] AkwaIbom State Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2011. Annual Reports, Akwa Ibom State Government Press, 8 -10.

[3] Alalade, O.A., Awoyemi, A.O., Matanmi, B.M., Olaoye, I.J., Olaitan, T.R., 2017, Farmers' perception of the activities of lower Niger basin authority in Ilorin east Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. Journal of Tropical Agriculture, Food, Environment and Extension, Vol. 16(2), 17 – 22.

[4]Asawalam, D. O., 2019, Achieving food security in Nigeria: Challenges and strategies. Lead Paper Presented at the 2nd National Conference of Society for Community and communication Development Research (SCCDR) held 13-16 August at Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria.

[5]Atukunda, P., Eide, W.B., Kardel, K.R., Iversen, P.O., Westerberg, A.C., 2021, Unlocking the potential for achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goal 2 - 'Zero Hunger' - in Africa: targets, strategies, synergies and challenges. Food Nutrition Research. 2021 May 26; 65. doi: 10.29219/fnr.v65.7686.

[6]Danladi, H., Ojo, C.O., 2018, Analysis of food access status among farming households in southern part of Gombe State, Nigeria. Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 8(3): 059-064.

[7] Fadipe, M.O., Ilori, A.R., Akinlade, S.O., Alao, O.A., 2019, Effects of involvement in sustainable agronomic practices on food security of rural household in Obafemi-Owode Local Government Area, Ogun State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 28th Annual National Congress of the Rural Sociological Association of Nigeria (RuSAN) held at held at Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife Between 7 and 11 October, Pp.63-65.

[8]Food and Agriculture Organization, 2020a, Food outlook: biannual report on global food markets. Biannual report, Rome, Pp. 41.http://www.fao.org/3/a-I8080e.pdf. Accessed on the 12th of June, 2024.

[9]Food and Agriculture Organization, 2020b, Achieving Zero Hunger in Africa by 2025, taking stock of progress.www.fao.org/3/i8624en/I8624EN.pdf. Accessed on the 12th of June, 2024.

[10]National Bureau of Statistics, 2020, Poverty index report of the thirty six States and Federal Capital Territory Abuja, Nigeria. file:///C:/Users/Fabsomma/Downloads

GDP_Report_Q2_2020.pdf. Accessed on the 12th of June, 2024.

[11]National Population Commission (NPC), 2019, Estimated population figures for Aka Ibom State, Nigeria. Federal Capital Territory Abuja.www.npc.org.ng. Accessed on the 12th of June, 2024.

[12]Nwaobiala, C.U., Ubeh, C.C., 2019, Effect of the Third National Fadama Additional Financing Project on the output and poverty levels of rice farmers in

Enugu State, Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology, Vol 18(2), 42 – 47.

[13]Nwaobiala, C.U., Uzochukwu, M.C., Chukwu, J., 2023, Socio-Economic Determinants of Cassava Farmers' Participation in USAID/MARKETS II Programme Development in AkwaIbom State, Nigeria. Journal of Agripreneurship and Sustainable Development, Vol. 6(1): 202 – 212.

[14]Nweze, N., Gloria, O., 2013, Prevalence of food insecurity and inadequate dietary pattern among households with and without children in Imo State, Nigeria. International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology. Vol. 5(9), 402-408.

[15]Oti, W.I., Idiong, C.I., Nsikan, E.B., Ekaette, S.U., 2014, Food security and productivity of urban food crop farming households in Southern Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Science and Education, 2(3), 01-12.

[16]Opalauwa, H.I., Opeyemi,, G.O., Owologbayi, J.A. Simon, G.O., 2019, Effect of off-farm income on food security status maize farmers in Lokoja Local Government Area of Kogi State, Nigeria. International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vol. 22(1), 4036 – 4043.

[17]Oyekale, T.O., Ayegbokiki, A.O., Adebayo, T.Y., 2017, Analysis of rural households' food security status in Ogun State, Nigeria.Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development, Vol. 1(4):163–174.

[18]United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2017, Maximizing Agricultural Revenue and Key Enterprises in Targeted Sites II (MARKETS).Chamois International Inc. http://www.usda.a.ol.htlml.Accessed on the 15 January, 2020.

[19]World Bank, 2019, The State of Food Security and Nutrition

https://www.google.com/search?biw=The+State+of+Food+Security+and+Nutrition+in+Nigeria.Accessed on 25.07.2020.

[20]***Google (2020). Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria [Google Maps]. www.akwaibomstate.org,ng, Accessed on the 15 January, 2020.