

Farmers usage of agrochemicals in a maize based multi cropping system: a case study
of Small holder Farmers in Ifedore local government area , Ondo State, Nigeria

Abstract

The need to introduce farmers to new technologies in agricultural production cannot be over emphasized. This is because most of the farmers still utilize the traditional agricultural practices which affect their farm output. The study therefore examined the factors affecting the adoption of agrochemicals by maize farmers in Ifedore Local Government, Ondo state. One Hundred (100) maize farmers were randomly selected from the study area. Both primary and secondary data were used for the study. The primary data was collected with the use of pre-tested and validated questionnaires. Direct observation techniques and interview of key informants were also used to enrich the data being collected. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages and inferential statistics such as Chi Square, Pearson product correlation were used to analyze the primary data. The findings from the study showed that 74 percent were below 50 years, 88 percent of the respondents had formal education while only 12 had no formal education. The study showed that 50 percent of the farmers had been into farming for more than 10 years. Most of the respondents (89 percent) were small-scale farmers cultivating 0.1 – 2.9 hectares. The farmers practiced multiple cropping systems with maize as the predominant crop. About 94 percent planted maize with other crops while only 5 percent planted maize only. The result revealed that 76 percent of the respondents asserted that they never used fertilizers. The Extension personnel visited 64 percent of the farmers .The study showed a significant relationship between education and the usage of fertilizer but a non significant relationship between marital status, religion, age and family size and usage of fertilizer. It is recommended that farmers should be visited frequently by extension agents with the objective of disseminating information on new technologies to enhance their level of production.

Introduction

Food production is very important to Nigerian economy. This is because; the rapid rate of population growth in the country which has been estimated at 3 percent annually has necessitated the need for increase food production to meet the demands of the increasing population. In the last decade Agricultural contribution to the country's Gross Domestic production declined from an average of 50.2 percent in 1960 – 1970 to 21.8 percent between 1976 – 1980, it increased to 39.6 percent in 1991 – 1995, 41.2 percent in 1986 – 1990, while it stabilized to an average of 40 percent in the 1990s and 41 percent in 2012. However, in recent time the performance of the agricultural sector improved, in 2003 a growth rate of about 6.1 percent was attained as an increase over 4percent in 2002 and 5.6 percent in 1999 – 2002 period. The reason for the above, could not but be attributed to recent Federal Government and International Agencies Programmes such as the Fadama Development Programme (NFDP), special credit schemes, the IFAD – assisted Cassava Multiplication Programme, the National Japanese – Assisted rice Production Programme among others.

Despite these programmes, there is the need to introduce the farmers to new technologies in agricultural production. This is because most of the farmers still utilize the traditional agricultural practices which affect their farm output. The high yielding variety seeds, which have been introduced to enhance production and productivity in the agricultural sector, requires adequate nutrient, but the continuous exploitation of the soil in the past without adequate attention to the management of soil fertility and crop health has resulted in gradual exhaustion of plant nutrients, infestation of plants pests and diseases and loss of quantity and quality of produce. This is still a major issue in Nigerian agricultural if adequate provision is not made for Agrochemical and fertilizers in food production, no matter the hybrid vigor of the seed or the planting technique used, maximum yield may not be achieved at the end of the task. With the introduction of modern agricultural production techniques and the adequate supply of plant nutrients (through the use of fertilizer) and sound soil management

practices, the rate of food production can be enhanced and high rate of production can be sustained under heavy and continuous cropping situation.

Agrochemicals include chemicals, which enhance growth and yield of the crop and are specifically designed to combat attacks of various pests.

In view of the above it is imperative to consider the factors affecting the acceptance of the synthetic substances (agrochemicals) used in agricultural production to enhance its efficiency. This ranges from fertilizers to pesticides, fungicides, herbicides etc. The above is necessary not only because it enhances productivity and promote a conducive environment for healthy growth of crops (Cremlyn 1991; Kenys 1995; Okunlola 2004) but also necessary to understand the extent to which the farmers are enlightened on the appropriate use of the agrochemical to minimize hazards and threat that inappropriate use could pose to both human health and the environment. This is because research has shown that Agrochemicals in farming must be appropriately used to avoid high level of residual effects of the chemicals in food substances (Osuntokun 1999; Sridhar 1999).

The role of agricultural extension with respect to the above cannot be underscored; this is with respect to dissemination of appropriate information to the farmers on the use of the agrochemicals. It is also important to understand the factors that influence farmers rate of adoption of the new technology so as to enhance appropriate planning and implementation of policies.

The study therefore seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the types of agrochemicals being introduced to the farmers?
2. What are the farmers' sources of information on the use of agrochemicals?
3. to what extent has extension activities affected the farmers' rate of adoption of agrochemicals?
4. What are the factors influencing farmers acceptance of the innovation?
5. Has this new technology affected the farmers' level of production?

The general objective of the paper is to identify the factors affecting the adoption of agrochemicals by maize farmers in the study area: the specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Ascertain the socio economic characteristics of the respondents.
2. Examine the sources of information available to the farmers.
3. Determine the effect of extension visitation on farmer's adoption of new technologies
4. Determine socio-economic factors that affect adoption of technology by farmers.

Hypotheses of the Study

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of respondent and adoption of the use of Agro input.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between extension visitation and the adoption of Agrochemicals.

Methodology:

The area of study is Ifedore Local Government Area of Ondo State. The study area is located in the rainforest belt of Nigeria with the climatic condition characterized by two distinct seasons. The rainy season is from March to October and dry season between November and February. The type of vegetation cover is rainforest type which makes the farmers to be involved in production of food crops like Yam, Maize, Cassava, Cocoa Yam and Cash crops like Cocoa, Oil palm, Kolanut etc. The people are predominantly farmers practicing multiple cropping systems.

Ifedore Local Government area (LGA) was purposively chosen among the Local Government Area of Ondo State because of the intensive use of agrochemicals by maize farmers in the area. List of communities in the Local Government was collected from about twenty communities listed, five communities were randomly chosen, and each community was divided into four wards out of which two were randomly selected from each ward making a total of twenty respondents from a community and total samples size of one hundred. Both primary and secondary data were used for the study. The primary data was collected with the use of pre-tested and validated questionnaires. Direct observation techniques and interview of key informants were also used to enrich the data being collected.

Method of Data Analysis:

Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts percentages and inferential statistics such as Chi Square, Pearson product correlation were used to analyze the primary data.

111 Result and Discussion

112 The section discussed results of data analysis obtained from the study.

113

114 Socio- Economic Characteristics of Respondents

115 Most of the respondents (31 percent) were in the middle age (41-50 years) while 25 percent
116 were between 31 – 40 years as shown in Table 1. From Table 1, most of the respondents (74 percent)
117 were still in their active years since they are below 50 years and are strong with vigor to be involved
118 in agricultural production. From the results most of the farmers are young and this is a factor that can
119 enhance their adoption of innovation. This is because the rate of adoption is high among the youths
120 than the older people, because they are more willing to take risk and try out new techniques. Seventy
121 two percent of the respondents do not have formal education, 29 percent had tertiary education and 35
122 percent attained secondary school education. This is a factor that could aid adoption of innovation by the respondents
123 because studies by [Williams et al (1981); Agbamu (1996); Okunlola Ajayi and Okunlola (2005)]
124 have shown that education influences adoption of innovation because it gives the farmer opportunity
125 to obtain information from many sources since he could read and write.

126 Table 1 also showed that 36 percent of the farmers had been into farming for 6 – 10 years, 27
127 percent for over 21 years while 14 percent have been into farming for 11 – 15 years and 16 – 20 years
128 respectively. The results showed that most of the respondents had adequate farming experience and
129 could easily analyze and take decision on whatever technology being introduced to them. Most of the
130 respondents (89 percent) are small-scale farmers cultivating 0.1 – 2.9 hectares according to Adubi and
131 Daramola (1998) classification, due to their small holdings they may find it difficult to take risks by
132 accepting new technology, thus, they prefer to stick to their known old methods.

133

134

135

Table 1: Respondents Personal Characteristics

	Variable	Percentage
i.	Age:	
	20 – 30	18.0
	31 – 40	25.0
	41 – 50	31.0
	51 – 60	18.0
	61 and above	8.0
ii.	Marital Status	
	Married	72.0
	Single	23.0
	Divorced	3.0
	Widowed	2.0
iii.	Religion	
	Christianity	
	Islam	79.0
	Traditionalists	16.0
	Educational Level	5.0
iv.	No Formal Education	
	Primary Education	12.0
	Secondary School	10.0
	Diploma	35.0
	Tertiary Education	14.0
	Farming Experience	29.0
	1 – 5 years	
v.	6 – 10 years	
	11 – 15 years	9.0
	16 – 20 years	36.0
	21 years and above	14.0
	Farm Size	14.0
	0.1 – 2.9 Ha	27.0
	2.10 – 4.99 Ha	
vi.	5.0 ha and above	89.0
		6.0
		5.0

136

137

138 Respondents Type of Farming Systems and Purpose of Maize Cultivation
139 In the area of study the farmers practice multiple cropping systems with maize as the
140 predominant crop. About 94 percent planted maize with other crops while only 5 percent
141 planted maize only as shown in Figure 1. From Figure 1, the reason why maize was a
142 predominant crop could be because it takes a shorter period of about 3 months to produce and
143 it could be easily intercropped with other crop, most specifically tuber crops. Most of the
144 farmers (59 percent) cultivate maize for family consumption and sales. Maize is processed
145 into different forms of which are consumed by the farmers; it is also used for commercial
146 production of animal feed. This serves as additional source of income for the family hence
147 the response of 33 percent of the farmers that they cultivate maize for commercial purposes.
148

149
150
151 Figure 1: Respondents Type and Purpose of Maize Cultivation
152

153 Use of Agro Chemicals and Fertilizers
154 About 14 percent of the respondents asserted that they never use fertilizers while 50
155 percent use fertilizer regularly and 26 percent occasionally as shown in Figure 2. The figure
156 revealed that 62 percent use Agrochemicals regularly while 28 percent utilize it occasionally
157 and 10 percent never use it. The reason why some of the farmers may not have used or be
158 using fertilizer and agrochemical could be because they could not afford the cost to purchase
159 and in some cases if the soil could still be fertile most especially if it is land that has just been
160 newly cultivated. The type of fertilizers and agrochemicals are shown in table 2.
161

162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192

Figure 2: Use of Fertilizers and Agrochemicals

Type of Fertilizers and Agrochemicals used by Respondents:
Table 2 has shown that 48 percent of the respondents use inorganic fertilizers such as N.P.K 15:15:15 and urea only on their farm, 44 percent use organic fertilizers such as compost etc. while 8 percent used both. The reason why most of the farmers do not use inorganic fertilizer could be because of the cost. Most of the farmers as stated earlier are small scale farmers with low income as such may not be able to afford the cost of the fertilizers, hence they may have resulted into the use of organic fertilizer to replenish their soil fertility. During discussion with some of the key informants, it was realized that some of the respondents do not use inorganic fertilizers because they do not have access to it and at times when they have access to it, they do not get it when it is required. Thirty-two percent of the farmers apply agrochemicals at most 2 times per season, 11 percent 3 – 4 times and 19 percent above 4 times in a season. Application of agrochemicals depends on type of Agrochemical but from the table most of the farmers apply insecticides, this shows that the insect threshold level is low in most of the farms more so it is maize based, however, in farms where it is applied more than 4 times it has serious cost implication on the farmers. Fifty two percent of the farmers also apply less than 10 litres per year. This could be because they are mostly small holder farmers, since farm size and threshold level determines the quality of Agrochemicals usage.

On the use of Agrochemicals, 33 percent utilize insecticides only 8 percent combine the use of insecticides and herbicides, and insecticides and fungicides respectively. However, 38 percent do not use agrochemicals. The reason why they do not us agrochemicals could be because they could not afford the cost and also non availability when it is required. The result implied that very few of the farmers use agrochemicals to control weed on their farms thus showing that they utilize mostly manual labour which may not be readily available and may not be effective. Most of the farmers (39 percent) were aware of the use of agrochemical and fertilizers through agricultural extension agents as shown in Figure 3.

Table 2: Type of Fertilizers and Agrochemicals used by Respondents

A.	Type of Fertilizer	Percentage
	Inorganic Fertilizers only	48
	Organic fertilizer only	44
	Both organic and inorganic	8
B	Type of Agrochemicals	
	Insecticides only	33

	Insecticides and herbicides	8.0
	Insecticides and fungicides	8.0
	Fungicides only	7.0
	Herbicides only	3.0
	All of the above	3.0
	None of the above	38.0
	Number of Agrochemical application per season	
C	Zero	
	1-2	38
	3-4	32
	4 and above	11
	Average Quantity of Agro chemicals used (Litres)	19
D	1 – 10	
	11 – 20	52
	20 and above	41
		7

193
194
195 Respondents' Sources of Awareness
196
197

198 Figure 3 shows that 35 percent of the farmers knew about agro-chemical and
199 fertilizers through the extension agents while 34 percent got the information from mass media
200 programmes. The reason for the above could be because the extension agents visits the
201 farmers and are trained to disseminate information on innovation to farmers and also help
202 them to acquire the necessary skills for its usage. Most extension visitation to the farmers is
203 also fortnight, as revealed in Table 3.

204
205
206
207 Table 3: Extension Visitation and Innovations Introduced to Farmers

	Variable	Percentage
a.	Contact with the farmers	
	Fortnightly	59
	Monthly	15
	Quarterly	5
	None	21
	Types of innovation introduced to farmers	
b.	Use of fertilizers and Agrochemicals	
	Management Techniques	60*
	Improved Crop Varieties	53*
		44*

208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229

Storage processing methods	25*
*Multiple responses	
The Extension personnel visit most of the farmers (59 percent) fortnightly 15 percent monthly and 21 percent quarterly. The result confirm with Williams, Bernor and Baxter (1984) report that under the Training and Visit (T & V) system, the extension agent visits the farmers fortnightly to disseminate impart points to them and get feed back. The result confirmed that the extension agents to a greater extent were practicing the T & V system as expected. This is because Ondo State ADP is still using T & V system of extension. Sixty percent of the farmers also stated that they introduced use of Agrochemicals and Fertilizer to them. This is expected to enhance their adoption of the innovation.	
Sources of Agrochemicals and Fertilizers to Farmers	
Twenty-four percent of the respondents obtained their inputs from government selling point and private vendors as shown in Table 4. Findings in Table 4 revealed that the farmers obtained the stated farm input from Government Agencies (24 percent) which include Agric. Input supply companies and private vendors (24 percent). Ten percent also obtained agrochemicals and Fertilizers from cooperative societies while 27 percent do not purchase the items at all. The implication of the above is that farmers have access to farm input from different sources and as such should not have problems in obtaining the goods for their farm. However, the respondents agreed that the cost of procurement affected the quantity of fertilizers being utilized on their farm as shown in table 5.	

Table 4: Sources of Agrochemicals and Fertilizers to Respondents.

Sources	Percentage
i. Government Agencies	24
ii. Private Agencies	24
iii. Cooperative Societies	10
iv. Government and Crop Societies	1
v. Government and Private Vendors	9
vi. Cooperative Societies and Private Vendor	5
vii. Do not purchase at all	27

230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249

Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Adoption of Technology by Farmers	
Table 5 has shown that 58 percent of the respondents agreed that cost of procurement influence the quantity of fertilizer they use on their farm. This could be because most of them have small farm holdings and low income, thus limiting the quantity of fertilizer they could afford. Similarly, 75 percent of the farmers agreed that cost of procurement affect the quantity of agrochemicals they acquire. The result confirms Iwala (2004), assertion that the cost of any (new) technology affects its adoption by farmers; this because once the cost is not economically feasible farmers will not accept it.	
Thirty-two percent of the farmers could not decide the effect of distance on their use of fertilizer however, 25 percent agreed that it affects their use of the inputs while 24 percent disagreed with 16 percent stating that they strongly disagreed with the statement. This shows that to a great extent farm distance from selling point is not a hindrance to fertilizer use and agrochemical. Contact of farmers with the extension influenced the use of these farm inputs. Forty percent of the respondents agreed to this fact, 13 percent strongly agreed while 5 disagreed and 4 strongly disagreed. The basic responsibility of extension agent is to disseminate information and train farmers on new technologies. Therefore, the response of the farmers confirms the effectiveness of extension activities in this area, although 38 were undecided those could be late adopters and laggards who takes a longer time or never adopt	

new technologies, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) categorized adopters to categories with late majorly/adopters and laggards in the last categories hence the result confirms the researchers classification. The respondents also asserted that the use of these farm inputs (Agrochemicals and Fertilizers) increased their farm outputs. This could be because education does not only give them opportunity to obtain information from various sources but also gives the ability to process such information. The result confirms Omoerighe (2004) assertion that education influences adoption of new technology.

The farm size of respondents also affects their use of fertilizer and Agrochemicals. Sixty-three percent of the respondents disagreed that it does not influence their farm size. The reason could be because their level of income is affected by their farm size thus, there is a limit to, the quantity of input they could use. The study also revealed that untimely supply of farm input affect their use of Agrochemical and Fertilizer (50 percent agreed and 5 percent disagreed). This could be because agricultural production is time bound hence, if these inputs are not available as at when required, it may not be useful to the farmers for the period.

Table 5: Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Adoption of Technology by Farmers.

SCORES						
S/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Cost of procurement of fertilizer affects the quantity being used on the farm	34	58	4	3	1
2.	Cost of procurement of Agrochemicals affects its use on the farm	12	75	8	4	1
3.	Farm distance to selling point affects the use of fertilizer	3	25	32	24	16
4.	Farm distance to selling point affect the use of Agrochemicals	4	11	31	47	7
5.	Contact with extension agent influenced the use of farm input (fertilizer and agrochemical)	13	40	38	5	4
6.	Use of agrochemicals fertilizer increased my farm output	16	40	42	1	1
7.	Untimely supply of the farm inputs (Fertilizer and Agrochemicals)	11	39	45	2	3
8.	Level of Education influencing my use of fertilizer and Agrochemicals	19	47	21	11	2
9.	My farm size does not influence my use of fertilizer and Agrochemicals	24	1	13	63	0

TEST OF HYPOTHESES

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic characteristics of respondents and the usage of fertilizer

The table below revealed that only education influences the usage of fertilizer, others, marital status, religion, age and family size were not significant. This could be because both married, divorced and singles use fertilizer. Education influences the usage of fertilizer because it could allow the respondents know when, and how to use the products since he/she has access to various sources.

Table 6: Relationship between Respondents Socio-Economic Characteristics and use of Fertilizer

Socio Economic Characteristics	Cal X ₂	Tab X ₂	Df	Decision
Age	8.78		5	N.S
Marital Status	6.77	7.65	3	N.S
Religion	1.65	5.89	2	N.S
Education	22.54	12.59	6	S
Farm Size	0.34	5.89	2	N.S

HO₂: From Table 7 there was a significant association between educational level, farm size of respondents and their use of Agrochemicals. This shows that Age, Marital Status, Religion does not influence the use of agrochemicals. The reason for the above could be because farm size influences the quantity of agrochemicals to be used and this has implication on the cost of procurement. Most large farmers also find it economical to use agrochemicals for weed and pest control while smallholder farmer may find it difficult to use agrochemicals and the use of the stated inputs.

Table 7: Relationship between Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents and Use of Agrochemicals.

Socio-economic Characteristics	Cal X ₂	Tab X ₂	Df	Decision
Age	28.78	-	5	N.S
Marital Status	10.50	9.59	4	S
Religion	0.959	9.48	4	N.S
Education	15.64	12.59	6	S
Farm Size	19.74	9.48	4	S

HO₃: There is no significant relationship between extension visitation and adoption of innovation (Fertilizer & Agrochemical.)

Table 8 showed that extension activities influenced the respondents' use of fertilizer and agrochemicals. This could be because with extension visit, farmers are educated and trained on the use of these agro-chemical and fertilizer.

Table 8: Chi Square Analysis of Association between Contacts with Extension Services and Adoption of Innovation.

Visit by	Cal	X ₂	Df	Decision
Agric extension agents	34.5	15.07	8	S.

Conclusion: The study has shown that most of the respondents are smallholder farmers who are between 31-40 years. The farmers utilize mostly pesticides on their farms while they use both organic and inorganic fertilizers. It is important to note that cost of input affects the use of fertilizers and agrochemicals; however the farmers asserted that the use of these inputs affects their level of production. Education, farm size and marital status influence the use of the farm inputs. It is important that adequate effort should be made to ensure that the farmers have access to these farm inputs so as to increase their level of production.

Recommendations

In view of the findings from the study, it is important that extension agents should visit farmers frequently with well defined impact points on the use of agrochemicals and other related inputs so as to disseminate information to them about new technologies and innovations to them. New technologies and innovations should be designed and packaged by scientists, policy makers and extension agents in a way that farmers will be able to adopt and use them

REFERENCES

- 318 Adubi A. A. and Daramola A. G. (1996): an empirical Analysis of Risk and Expected Return
- 319 in Small Scale Agriculture in Nigeria. Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture
- 320 35 (4) 384 – 397.
- 321 Agbamu J.U. (1996): Perspectives in Agricultural Extension and Rural Development (ed),
- 322 Springfield Publishers Ltd., Owerri, Nigeria 2009: 361-386.
- 323
- 324 Ajayi M. T. and. Okunlola J. O (2005): Impact of Agricultural Extension Services on
- 325 adoption of Root Crops Technologies in Ondo State, Nigeria. South Africa Journal of
- 326 Agricultural Extension . 34 (2)180-185 .
- 327
- 328 Benor and Baxter (1984): Agricultural Extension: The training and Visit Extension: The
- 329 World Bank, Washington D. C. and U.S.A. 1984: 90 – 115.
- 330
- 331 Gremyling, Richard and Williams (1991): Agrochemicals: Preparation and most of Action.
- 332 pp.80 – 89.
- 333
- 334 Iwala I (2004): Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Adoption of Innovation by Small-Holder
- 335 Oil Palm Farmers in Ondo State and Edo State. Ph.D thesis Department of Agric.
- 336 Econs & Extension FUTA Akure. 2004:.P72
- 337
- 338 Kang B. T. (1995): Fertilizes: Definitions and Calculation IITA Research Guide 1995: 6-8.
- 339
- 340 Okunlola J.O. (2004): Socio-Economic effect of oil exploration and exploitation activities in
- 341 Ilaje Communities of Ondo State, Nigeria Journal of Development and Area Studies
- 342 U.S.A. 2004:1(2) 46-56.
- 343
- 344 Omoerigbe P (2004): Socio-Economic factors affecting adoption of Innovations by Small
- 345 Holder Rubber Farmer in Delta State. 2004.Unpublished(M.Tech Thesis).
- 346 Osuntokun A. O (1999): Agenda for a New Millenium in Nigeria,s Endangered Environment eds J.
- 347 O. Filani A. Sridhar. African Press 1999:8 – 17.
- 348
- 349 Rogers and Shoe Maker (1971): Assimilation of New Technologies in the Social System
- 350 “Futures 1971:7(2) 357-375.
- 351

352 Sridhar, A (1999): You, your Health and the Environment. In Nigeria’s Endangered
353 Environment: Agenda for a new Millennium Eds J. O. Abiodun, Filani A., Sridhar,
354 Africa press Ltd..
355 Williams S. K., Fenley, T. M., Williams, C. E (1981): a Manual for Agricultural Extension
356 Workers in Nigeria. Published by Les Shyraden, Ibadan Nigeria.
357