

**Awareness and Utilization of Improved Plantain Production Technologies in Combating  
Food Security among Plantain Household Farmers in Abia State.**

**Abstract**

The study assessed the awareness and utilization of improved plantain production technologies in combating food security among plantain household farmers in Abia State. Random sampling technique was used to select 60 respondents. Structure questionnaire was used for data collection. Data collected were analyzed with descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentages and means. Results of the study showed that a good proportion (56.7%) of the respondents had their plantain located in the field mainly for commercial purpose (78.3%), got their planting materials from proceedings of previous owned farm (58.3%), had 100 – 200 number of stands, planted and made up to ₦80,000.00 – ₦110,000.00 and above per annum. The major technologies aware and utilized by the respondents were weeding (application of herbicides – 98.3%), Pruning – (66.7%) and Desuckering, (2-3 stands) (66.7%) respectively while others were in negligence. The respondents' sources of information were mainly fellow farmers (95%) and friends/relatives (83.3%). However, the respondents' level of awareness on improved technologies was low (44.2%). Hence the study recommended that more awareness should be created by the extension agents with demonstration and fellow-up for proper utilization of the technologies.

**Keywords:** Awareness, utilization, improved plantain, technologies, Plantain Farmer

## 28    **Introduction**

29    Plantain (*Musa paradisiaca*.L) is undoubtedly one of the old cultivated fruits that has  
30    occupied a strategic position in agricultural production across the globe. Fakayode *et al*  
31    (2011) saw plantain as a crop that could bridge the gap between demand and supply of the  
32    basic carbohydrate staples. About 70 million people in the African sub-region are estimated  
33    to derive more than one quarter of their food energy requirement from plantain (IITA, 2014).  
34    In Nigeria also plantain is known as one of the major staple food as the country ranked the  
35    fifth highest producer of the crop (Fortaleza 2011, FAO, 2004). Besides being the staple for  
36    many people, plantain delicacies are favoured snack for people even in other ecologies (IITA,  
37    2014). It also contributes to food security, employment and diversification of income both in  
38    rural and urban areas, thus help in poverty alleviation (Dimelu, 2015; CTA, 2005). For  
39    instance, plantain chips is waxing as a growing industry with high demand being experienced  
40    (Olumba and Rahji, 2014).

41    Despite its prominence, Nigeria does not feature among plantain exporting nations because it  
42    produces more for local consumption than for export (Fortaleza, 2012). In addition, the small-  
43    scale farmers depend more on traditional technologies such as local cultivars, poor farming  
44    techniques for reproduction which is characterized by poor yield and inefficiency (IITA,  
45    2009). Thus, the need for transformation of traditional farming system for improved practices  
46    which leads to increased food production. Similarly, it has been evident that the issue of low  
47    level of uptake of technologies have resulted largely for low level and poor performance in  
48    agricultural sectors (Ojeleye, 2009; Oyewole and Ojeleye, 2015).

49

50    However, one way of improving agricultural productivity is through creation of awareness of  
51    improved technologies to farmers as well as encourage in the utilization of the technologies.  
52    Hence increasing the productivity of small-holder agriculture and improve wellbeing for  
53    millions of the poor households (Doss 2006, Ouma *et al.*, 2006). Based on the above issue

about 14 different plantain technologies have been developed and released by International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), such as: weeding, propping, pruning, fertilizer/manure application, hybrid varieties, mulching, hot water treatment, agro-chemical application, sucker multiplication, sucker cleaning, planting space, desuckering, planting time and debudding (Akintade *et al* 2014). In spite of it, some of these farmers lack relevant information on some of these technologies (Olumba 2014). Consequently, the utilization level of the technologies are low.

Abia State especially Ohafia zone is one of the zones where plantain production is the primary commodity for investment in Nigeria. Yet the utilization of the improved plantain technologies is still questionable because in the absence of awareness, utilization will be ignored or low. On the other hand, farmers are always ready to utilize or adopt any technology that will increase their income from the farm (IITA, 2009). Therefore the pertinent questions however are:-

What are the plantain production characteristics of the farm households, what types of improved plantain production technologies are disseminated to farmers, what are the sources of farmers' information and what is the level of awareness of improved plantain production technologies?

Therefore, the study was designed to assess the awareness and utilization of improved plantain production technologies by farmers in combating food security in Abia State, Nigeria. Specifically the study sought to:

- describe the plantain production characteristics of the farm households in the study area,
- ascertain the type of improved plantain production technologies,
- identify the source of information of the improved plantain technologies,

- determine the level of awareness of the improved technologies by the farmers.

80

## 81 **Methodology**

82 The study was conducted in Abia State, Nigeria specifically Ohafia Agricultural Zone. Ohafia  
83 Agricultural zone is one of the three agricultural zones in Abia State. It is made up of five (5)  
84 Local Government Areas namely: Arochukwu, Bende, Isuikwuato, Uzuakoli, and  
85 Umunneochi. The zone was chosen because of the prominence in plantain cultivation. Ohafia  
86 agricultural zone has five blocks namely Arochukwu, Bende, Isuikwuato, Uzuakoli, and  
87 Umunneochi. All the blocks were purposively selected while lists of plantain farmers were  
88 collected from ADP extension agents supervising each of the blocks. In each list (block) a  
89 minimum of 20 plantain farmers were identified and 12 farmers were randomly selected;  
90 giving a total of 60 respondents for the study. Primary data were collected through the use of  
91 structured questionnaire. Data collected were analyzed with a simple descriptive statistics  
92 such as frequency distribution, percentages and means.

93

94 Objectives 1, 2, 3 were determined with frequency and percentage while objective 4 was  
95 determined with mean percentage. To determine objective 4 – (level of awareness of  
96 improved plantain production technologies), a list containing twelve (12) technologies of  
97 plantain was presented to the respondents in which they were asked to state whether they are  
98 aware of the technology or not.

99 The percentage score for each technology were added together and divided by the number of  
100 technology which gives the mean percentage. However, 50% and above was used to  
101 determine high of awareness, order wise low awareness.

102

## 103 **Results and Discussions.**

### 104 **Production characteristics of the respondents**

Table 1 reveals the production characteristics of the respondents. The result shows that a good proportion of the respondents (56.7%) had their plantain location on the field as against (43.3%) that planted at the backyard and along the road. This is in contrast with Bayeri *et al.*, (2004) who reported that in the South Eastern part of Nigeria, plantain is predominantly planted at the backyard/compound. Planting in the field is an evident of large – scale production that leads to commercialization and aids in combating food insecurity. The result also shows that (59%) of the respondents sourced for their planting materials from the proceeding of previous year owned farm and about (41%) got from friends and neighbours, research institutes and ADP/Ministry of agriculture. By implication there may be low genetic transfer in the crop which could be caused as a result of increase of diseases and pests infestation from existing plants reproduced from previous cuttings. There may be also lack of necessary information from extension and research Institutes which could have been avoided by the use of improved planting materials.

In terms of number of stands planted (71.7%) of the respondents had 101 – 200 stands of plantain in their farms and a lesser proportion (28.3%) had 1 – 100 respectively. This could be attributed to a greater proportion (78.3%) of the households that engaged in plantain production basically for commercial purpose. Furthermore, (83.4%) of the respondents generate annual income of ₦80,000. 00 – ₦110,000.00 and above. However, the income informs production interest of more respondents

130 **Table 1. Distribution of Production Characteristics of the Respondents.**

| <b>Production characteristics</b>    | <b>Freq = n = 60</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Location</b>                      |                      |                   |
| Field                                | 34                   | 56.7              |
| Backyard                             | 25                   | 41.7              |
| Along road side                      | 1                    | 1.6               |
| <b>Source of planting materials</b>  |                      |                   |
| Proceedings from previous owned farm | 35                   | 58.3              |
| Friends/Neighbours                   | 15                   | 25.0              |
| Research Institutes                  | 3                    | 5.0               |
| ADPs/Ministry of Agriculture         | 7                    | 11.7              |
| <b>Number of stands planted</b>      |                      |                   |
| 1 – 50                               | 7                    | 11.6              |
| 51 – 100                             | 10                   | 16.7              |
| 101 – 150                            | 30                   | 50.0              |
| 151 – 200                            | 13                   | 21.7              |
| <b>Reasons for Production</b>        |                      |                   |
| Commercial                           | 47                   | 78.3              |
| Personal                             | 13                   | 21.7              |
| <b>Income realized per year</b>      |                      |                   |
| 20,000 – 49,000                      | 5                    | 8.3               |
| 50,000 – 79,000                      | 5                    | 8.3               |
| 80,000 – 109,000                     | 10                   | 16.7              |
| 110,000 and above                    | 40                   | 66.7              |

132 **Source: Field Survey, 2017**

133 **Types of plantain production technologies disseminated**

134 The result in Table 2 reveals that there were about 12 improved plantain technologies  
 135 disseminated by the respondents. Thus, the philosophy of improved technologies is to  
 136 increase productivity, reduce infestation of disease and pests as well as decrease food  
 137 insecurity. In other words, the result reveals that among the plantain technologies  
 138 disseminated, weeding (application of herbicide – 98.3%), planting space 3/2 metre (83.3%)  
 139 mulching – (71.7%), pruning – (66.7%). Desuckering (2 – 3 stands – 66.7%) highly utilized  
 140 while (48.3%) and (43.3%) practiced mulching and planting spaces respectively. Other  
 141 improved technologies were insignificantly utilized, showing that a considerable percentage  
 142 of the respondents however did not either understand the technologies or lack knowledge of  
 143 the importance. It also implies that neither the extension workers did not fully explain nor  
 144 demonstrate the application of the technologies nor farmers lack interest on the technologies.  
 145 Thus, the study suggests for more creation of awareness of the technologies for farmers to  
 146 understand the application and put them into practical use for increase production.

147

148 **Table 2: Distribution of Improved Plantain Technologies disseminated/practiced by the**  
 149 **Respondents**

| Technologies disseminated/Practiced | Freq = n = 60 | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Weeding (application of herbicides) | 59            | 98.3       |
| Propping                            | 11            | 18.3       |
| Pruning                             | 40            | 66.7       |
| Fertilizer application              | 12            | 70.0       |
| Nysrid                              | 11            | 18.3       |
| Mulching                            | 43            | 71.7       |

|                                      |    |      |
|--------------------------------------|----|------|
| Hot water treatment                  | 5  | 8.3  |
| Agro chemical application            | 8  | 13.3 |
| Sicker cleaning                      | 4  | 6.7  |
| Sucker multiplication (split. Tech.) | 1  | 1.7  |
| Planting space (3/2 metre)           | 50 | 83.3 |
| Desuckering (2 – 3 stands)           | 40 | 66.7 |
| Pest/Disease control                 | 29 | 48.3 |

150

151 **Source: Field survey 2017. Multiple responses recorded.**

152 **Sources of Information of Plantain Technologies.**

153 Table 3 shows that majority (95%) of the farmers got the information from fellow farmers  
 154 and friends/relatives (83.3%). It is an indication that information flow faster and easier  
 155 among farmers due to close contact and sharing of views. This result agrees with the work of  
 156 Nwachukwu (2014) that fellow farmers' aid in the dissemination of innovation among local  
 157 farmers. Information from ADP (8.3%) and Ministry of Agriculture were the least (8.3%)  
 158 respectively. It shows poor extension services. Therefore, the ADPs should stand and take-up  
 159 their responsibilities in information dissemination in order to encourage productivity among  
 160 farmers.

161 **Table 3: Distribution of the respondents based on sources of Information on Improved**  
 162 **Plantain Technology**

| Sources of Information | Freq = n = 60 | Percentage |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|
| ADP – Extension Agents | 5             | 8.3        |
| Friends/Relatives      | 50            | 83.3       |
| Fellow Farmers         | 57            | 95.0       |
| Mass Media             | 8             | 13.3       |

|                         |   |     |
|-------------------------|---|-----|
| Ministry of Agriculture | 5 | 8.3 |
|-------------------------|---|-----|

**Source: Field Survey 2017. Multiple Responses recorded.**

### **Level of Awareness of Improved technologies by farmers.**

The result in Table 4 shows that majority of the respondents were aware of weeding (application of herbicides – 100%). Desuckering – 2 – 3 stand (83.3%), planting space (3/2 metres – 66.7%) and pruning – (65%) respectively. However, the respondents indicated not aware of the other technologies and more especially Hot water treatment (100%); Sucker multiplication (Split technology – (100%), Agro-Chem. (83.3%) and Propping (66.7%). Consequently, resulting to low level of utilization of technologies.

This confirms the work of Olumba and Rahji (2014) that most farmers seem to lack information on hot water treatment and chemical application. Thus extension agents should put more efforts in creating awareness through demonstration of the technologies for better understanding and proper utilization of all the technologies in other to promote bomber harvest.

**Table 4: Distribution of the respondents based on level of awareness of Improved Plantain Technologies**

| Technologies                       | Aware |            | Not Aware |            |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|
|                                    | Freq  | Percentage | Freq      | Percentage |
| Weeding (application of herbicide) | 60    | 100        | -         | -          |
| Propping                           | 20    | 33.3       | 40        | 66.7       |
| Pruning                            | 39    | 65         | 21        | 35.0       |
| Fertilizer application             | 20    | 33.3       | 40        | 66.7       |
| Nysrid                             | 20    | 33.3       | 45        | 66.7       |

|                                          |    |      |    |      |
|------------------------------------------|----|------|----|------|
| Mulching                                 | 39 | 65   | 21 | 35.0 |
| Hot water treatment                      | -  | -    | 60 | 100  |
| Agrochem application                     | 10 | 16.7 | 50 | 83.3 |
| Sucker cleaning                          | 20 | 33.3 | 40 | 66.7 |
| Sucker multiplication (Split technology) | -  | -    | 60 | 100  |
| Planting space (3/2 metres)              | 40 | 66.7 | 20 | 33.3 |
| Desuckering (2 – 3 Stands)               | 50 | 83.3 | 10 | 16.7 |
| Mean Percentage                          |    | 44.2 |    | 55.8 |

**Source: field survey 2017.**

## **Conclusion**

The level of awareness and utilization of Improved plantain technologies among farm households was low as the information of the technologies were mainly got from fellow farmers, relatives and friends. However, much impact was not made by the extension agents in the dissemination of the technologies.

Therefore, the study recommends that the ADP should build up a requisite knowledge and skills for farmers on the improved technologies. This could be achieved through proper demonstration and training of these farmers in the utilization of the improved plantain technologies, thus combating food insecurity.

## **References**

Akintade, T.F. Okunlola, J.O, Akinbani A.S. (2016). Factors Influencing Adoption of Plantain Improved Technologies among small holder farmers in Edo State, Nigeria. International Journal of Bio, Agric and Health care 6(6).

197 Baiyeri K.P, Tenkouno A; Mba, B.N and Mbagwu J.S.K (2004). Phonological and Yield  
 198 Evaluation of Musa Genotypes under Alley and sole Cropping systems in Southern  
 199 Nigeria. Tropical and Subtropical Agroecosystems 4(3) p 137 – 144.  
 200  
 201 CTA (2005). The Tropical Agriculturist Plantain Banana. Macmillan Oxford Ox 43pp  
 202 Dimelu M.U. (2015). Involvement of farm households in Banana and Plantain production in  
 203 Aguata Agricultural Zone of Anambra State. Journal of Agricultural Extension. A  
 204 publication of AESON ISSN 1119-944x. vol.19 (1) June. P 107 – 110.  
 205  
 206 Doss C.R. (2006): Understanding farm level technology adoption lessons learnt from  
 207 CIMMYTs micro-survey in Eastern Africa. CIMMYT Economic working, Mexico,  
 208 D.F. p 7 – 30.  
 209  
 210 Fakayode B.S, Rahji. M.A.Y. Ayinde O, Nnom G.O. (2011). An economic assessment of  
 211 plantains production in Rivers State, Nigeria. International Journal of Agriculture,  
 212 Economics and Rural Development 4(2).  
 213  
 214 Food and Agriculture Organization AGROSTAT Database (2004). Food and Agriculture  
 215 (IITA – 2009). New Plantain and banana cultivars improve crops yields in Sub-Sahara  
 216 Africa. <http://old.iita.org>  
 217  
 218 Fortaleza C. (2017). The Ultimate wealth guide to making millions of naira yearly, with  
 219 plantain farming in Nigeria <http://plantainfarming.blogspot.com>  
 220  
 221 IITA (2014). International Institute of Tropical Agriculture. Annual report. [www.iita.org](http://www.iita.org)  
 222

- 223 Ojeleye O.A. (2009). Economic evaluation of usage of farmers' productivity enhancing  
224 practices in the Nigerian Northern Savannah. An unpublished M.Sc. Thesis submitted  
225 to the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, ABU, Zaria.  
226
- 227 Olumba C.C., Rahji M.A.Y (2014). An analysis of the determinants of the adoption of  
228 Improved Plantain Technologies in Anambra State, Nigeria.  
229
- 230 Ouma, J.O; De Groot H, Owuor G. (2006): Determination of Improved maize seed and  
231 fertilizer use in Kenya: Policy implication presented at the International Association  
232 of Agricultural Economics Conference, Gold Coast Australia August. p 12 – 18.  
233
- 234 Oyewole, S.O.and Ojeleye O.A. (2015). Factors influencing the use of improved farm  
235 practices among small-scale farmers in Kano State of Nigeria. Net Journal of Agric.  
236 Science 3(1):1-4