

Activities of farmers in Rice Production in Awka North Local Government, Anambra State, Nigeria

Abstract

Nigeria is a heavy importer of rice and the rate of importation is increasing year by year at an alarming rate. This necessitates the need to ascertain activities of farmers in rice production and specifically in Akwa North Local Government Area, Anambra State, Nigeria. A multi-stage sampling technique was employed in selecting 90 rice farmers for the study. Interview schedule was used to collect data. Data collected were analyzed using percentage, mean score and factor analysis. The findings show that rice farmers used personal savings (75.6%) as capital for engagement in rice production while about 67% had no access to tractor hence 73.3% used hired labour in rice production. On average, the respondents owned 2.7 hectares of land but cultivated 1.7 hectares of this land with rice. They planted different varieties of rice seeds obtained from personal reserve (66.7%) and had no alternative water supply (83.3%). They practiced sole cropping (90%) and planted their seeds by broadcasting method (53.3%). NPK 20:10:10 was fertilizer that 60% of the farmers used in their rice farms and 61.1% processed rice immediately after harvest. Average output and yield from rice were 3.2tonnes and 1.4tonnes/hectare per year respectively. Soil fertility and biotic stress, farm-farmers related problems and economic related problems were extracted as constraints to rice production in the area. The study recommends that researchers that are involved in rice breeding should develop high yielding rice varieties while agricultural extension agents should transfer the innovations to farmers and ensure that farmers adopt them through follow up and feed-back exercises/visits to these farmers targeted at boosting output, yield and income from rice production.

Key words: Agronomic practices output yield constraints rice

Introduction

Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa, with a population of over 167 million people as at 2012 (National Population Commission (NPC), 2014). Its domestic economy is dominated by agriculture, which accounts for about 40% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and engaged two-thirds of the labour force (Ayinde, Adewumi, and Ojehomon, 2009). The food sub-sector of Nigerian agriculture parades a large array of staple crops, made possible by the diversity of agro-ecological production systems. The major cereals are: sorghum, maize, millet,

rice, and also wheat. These are the commodities that are of considerable importance for food security, expenditures and incomes of households.

Of all the staple crops, rice (*Oryza sativa*) has risen to a position of preeminence and is the fastest growing commodity in Nigeria's food basket (Atande, 2003). It is one of the most important healthy and staple foods (International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), 2006) and influences the livelihoods and economies of several people. It can provide the nationally required food security minimum of 2,400 calories per person per day (Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), 2000; David and Terwase, 2011).

In Nigeria, rice consumption was 5 Metric Tonnes in 2010 and is expected to reach 36 Metric Tonnes by 2050 with 5.1% annual growth. An average Nigerian consumes 24.8 kg of rice per year, representing 9 per cent of annual calorie intake (IRRI, 2001). Due to its increasing contribution to the per capita calorie consumption of Nigerians, the demand for rice has been increasing at a much faster rate than its domestic production and more than in other African countries since mid 1970s (FAO, 2001). Longtau (2003) noted that rice is one of the crops where the gap between potential and actual production is wide.

As a response to the prevailing rice supply deficit situation in Nigeria, successive Nigerian governments intervened in the rice sector by coming up at various times with policies and programmes. However, the policies and programmes were observed not to have been consistent. These erratic policies reflect the dilemma of securing cheap rice for consumers and a fair price for the producers. Notwithstanding the various policy measures, domestic rice production has not increased sufficiently to meet the increased demand (Okoruwa and Ogundele, 2004). Research has shown that the demand for rice in Nigeria has been increasing at a much faster rate than domestic production, making country to expend huge amount of foreign

exchange on the importation of rice (FAO, 2001). For example, imports of wheat, rice, fish and sugar alone cost Nigeria 1 trillion Naira (approximately 6 billion USD) in foreign exchange annually and the imports are growing at an alarming rate of 11 per cent per annum (Adamu, 2012). Resorting to importation is not the ultimate solution to improve rice sector rather identifying and addressing challenges and other relevant issues surrounding the sector. These factors mentioned above and more necessitated the need to investigate on the activities of farmers in rice production in Awka North Local Government Area (LGA) of Anambra State, Nigeria. Specifically the study described production activities of the rice farmers; identified agronomic practices they use as well as constraining factors to rice production in the area.

Methodology

The population of the study included all rice farmers in the LGA. A multi-stage sampling method was employed in selecting respondents. The first stage involved the purposive selection of three towns (Ebenebe, Amanuke and Achalla) from the Nine (9) towns in the LGA, due to their high level of production in rice enterprise. The second stage involved simple random selection of 3 villages from each of the three towns giving a total of nine villages for the study. The third stage involved simple random sampling of 10 rice farmers from each of the nine villages making a total of 90 rice farmers for the study. Interview schedule that contained information based on the specific objectives of the study was used to elicit information from the respondents.

The farmers (respondents) were asked to indicate their sources of labour, capital, access to tractor services, their farm size, etc. in order to assess respondents' production activities. Respondents were also requested to answer relevant questions pertaining to the agronomic practices they employ in their rice farm e.g. variety grown, cropping pattern used, method of land preparation, fertilizer application, weeding, harvesting, type of tools used etc. Constraints to rice production were ascertained using a modified four point Likert type scale with responses as; to a great extent (4), to a moderate extent (3), to a little extent (2) and to no extent (1) with a mean of 2.5. Data generated were further subjected to factor analysis while varimax rotation

with Kaiser nationalization (Farinde and Alabi, 2015) was used to extract the perceived constraints into three factor components. (Variable with a loading of 0.4 and above is considered as having a high loading and may be used in naming a factor. Variables that loaded in more than one factor were also dropped). Frequency, percentage, mean score and factor analysis were used for data analysis.

Results and Discussion

Production activities of the respondents

Sources of Labour:

Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents (73.3%) used hired labour while the rest (36.7%) used family labour in their farm enterprise. In this era of ageing farmers and migration of youth to urban centers in search of white collar jobs, use of hired labour in agriculture especially in rice production that is labour intensive becomes inevitable. On the other hand, use of hired labour increases cost of production leaving farmers especially peasant/subsistent farmers with little or no income.

Source of Capital:

Majority (75.6%) of the respondents sourced their capital from their personal savings, 23.3% sourced from friends and family while 10% sourced from the bank and financial institution. Most of the respondents may have relied majorly on their personal savings as source of capital probably because of the high interest rate charged by the banks and other financial institutions and lack/ inability of the farmers to provide collateral in order to source the fund from these institutions. However, funds from informal sources especially when they are small may not allow an entrepreneur like farmer to boost his enterprise to the level he/she wants.

Access to Tractor Services:

Findings on the access to tractors show that majority (66.7%) of the respondents did not have access to tractor services while the rest (33.3%) had access to tractor services. This may mean that most of the farmers may not have the capabilities to cultivate large hectares of land

due to limitation associated with labour. Also, Odigbo and Onwualu (1994) noted that an average peasant farmer in Nigeria owns less than two hectares that is barely enough to produce what is needed to feed the family. Using tractor or other machines for agriculture in this relatively small size of land may not be economical.

Farm land owned and cultivated with rice

Entries in Table 1 reveal that higher proportion (48.9%) of the respondents owned a farm land within the range of 1-2.9 hectares, 17.8% had less than one hectare of farm land, 15.6% owned between 3- 4.9 hectares while 13.3% owned farm land ranging from 5- 6.9 hectares. The average farm size of the respondent was 2.7 hectares. This finding is consistent with Igbokwe (2000) who reported that the major occupation in the area was farming with land holding ranging from 2-3 hectares per household on the average. The table also shows that majority (62.2%) of the respondents cultivated rice on 1-2.9 hectares of land, 18.9% of them cultivated in less than 1 hectare while 16.7% cultivated on 3-4.9 hectares of farm land. On average, the respondents cultivated 1.7 hectares of land with rice. The findings tend to suggest that the respondents did not cultivate the entire land they owned with rice. Lack of labour, production of other staple/arable crops, rearing of livestock, practices of bush fallow, shifting cultivation/ land rotation among others may be responsible for this.

Yield of rice:

Table 1 further indicates that about 56% of the respondents obtained rice yield of 1-1.9 tonnes/hectare (t/ha), 23.3% obtained less than 1 t/ha while the rest (21.1%) obtained between 2-2.9 t/ha in a year. The average rice yield of the respondents was 1.4 t/ha per year. This average yield (1.4t/ha) is very low when compared with 3.0t/ha in places like Cote d' Ivoire and Senegal (Aye and Oboh, 2006) and that of the world average yield of 3.84t/ha (Norman and Kebe,

2006). This signifies the need to strategize measures in order to boost rice production in the area and in the country at large.

Table 1: Production activities of the respondents

Parameter	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean (M)
Source of labour*			
Family labour	33	36.7	
Hired labour	66	73.3	
Source of Capital*			
Personal savings	68	75.6	
Family and friends	21	23.3	
Financial institution	9	10	
Tractor Services			
No access	60	66.7	
Access	60	33.3	
Total Farm Size (ha)			
Less than 1	16	17.8	2.7
1- 2.9	44	48.9	
3 - 4.9	14	15.6	
5- 6.9	12	13.3	
7 and above	4	4.4	
Share of rice in total cropped area (ha)			
Less than 1	17	18.9	1.7
1-2.9	56	62.2	
3-4.9	15	16.7	
5 and above	2	2.2	
Rice yield (T/Ha)			
Less than 1	21	23.3	1.4
1-1.9	50	55.6	
2-2.9	19	21.1	

* Multiple responses

AGRONOMIC PRACTICES OF THE FARMERS

Pre-Planting and planting operations

Varieties of rice grown and their sources:

Table 2 shows that about 34% of the respondents cultivated rice variety called MARZ, 31.1% grew R-Box, 17.8% grew FARO-45, 15.6% grew 1416 and 13.3% grew a variety called BJ. The table further shows that majority (66.7%) of these farmers obtained these varieties

from preserved seeds from previous harvest, 27.8% got/bought from the market (seed dealers), 4.4% obtained from research institutes while the rest (2.2%) obtained from extension agents. This finding suggests that the respondents did not source or grow new improved varieties from reliable sources like research institute, ministry of agriculture rather used or planted seed from previous harvest which may be one of the reasons for low yield (Table 1) . In line with this finding, Norman and Kebe (2006) reported that the low productivity on farmers' field is due to several constraints including poor seed management. Thus, Information and Communication Support System (ICS) for Agricultural growth in Nigeria, (2008) recommended that farmers should consult the nearest agricultural office or seed companies for certified seeds of recommended varieties in their area.

Water management:

Table 2 reveals that majority (83.3%) of the respondents did not make use of any alternative water supply apart from rainfall while the rest (16.7%) resorted to alternative water supply to augment for the water requirement in their rice farm. Those that used alternative water sourced it from river (11.1%), ponds (3.4%) and dams(2.2%). Rice is a water loving plant and about 3,000 to 5,000 litres of water are required to produce a kilogram of rice grain. Wherever irrigation facility is available, water should be applied during critical growth stages like tillering, panicle initiation, panicle emergence and grain filling stage to get maximum yield (Anup, Patel, Ramkrushna and Munda, et. al., 2012). In corroboration, Daramola (2005) stated that irrigated system (alternative water supply) has the highest yields (3.7t/ha) in rice production. Unfortunately, most of these rice farmers did not provide irrigation or alternative water supply to their rice farms. Which may be another factor that contributed to low yield in rice production in the area (Table1).

Cropping Pattern:

Table 2 also shows that majority (90%) of the respondents engaged in **mono-cropping** (planting rice alone) while the remaining (10%) planted rice with other crops. Field observations showed that they intercropped rice with groundnut, soybeans, cocoyam and other crops. Intercropping rice with legumes could help reduce weed problems, improve soil fertility and enhance farm income.

Method of Land Clearing

Table 2 indicates that (58.9%) of the respondents used hand tools like hoe; cutlass etc. in clearing their land, 26.6% used herbicides while the rest (6.7%) used mechanized equipment like bulldozer and tractor coupled implements to clear their lands for rice farming. Most of these farmers practice what may be termed “hoe **technology**”. Kutte and Tya (2000) stressed that hoe technology makes use of tools and implements that rely on human muscles. Relying on this type of technology may mean that farmers cannot cultivate much land because of the limit of human power (Odigbo and Onwualu, 1994).

Method of Planting:

Entries in Table 2 show that 53.3% of the respondents planted rice through broadcasting of the seeds directly into the main field, 21.1% broadcasted in a nursery and later transplanted to the main field, 13.4% of the respondents planted their rice **directly by dibbling** into the main field while 12.2% planted their seeds using drilling method (the use of machines to plant which is usually employed on a large hectare of land). Broadcasting method used by most of these rice farmers helps to reduce labour/ cost of transplanting, waist breaking task of dibbling in the field

and cost of hiring drilling machine. Uguru (1996) noted that broadcasting is used in area where labour is expensive while Chukwu (2003) and Daramola (2005) noted that nursery practices and dibbling reduces seed waste as opposed to broadcasting but they require much labour. Farmers should be encouraged to adopt dibbling method instead of broadcasting in order to ensure/maintain adequate sowing depth, plant population, spacing and optimum/maximum output and yield.

Table 2: Pre-Planting and Planting Operations of the Respondents

Pre-planting and planting operations	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Varieties*		
BJ	13	13.3
MARZ	31	34.4
FARO 45	16	17.8
1415	14	15.6
R Box	28	31.1
Source of Seed*		
Personal reserve/stored seed	60	66.7
Market	25	27.8
Research institute	4	4.4
Extension Agent	2	2.2
Alternative water supply		
Yes	15	16.7
No	75	83.3
Sources of alternative water supply		
None	75	83.3
River	10	11.1
Dams	2	2.2
Ponds	3	3.4
Cropping patterns		
Sole	81	90
Mixed	9	10
Method of land clearing*		
Herbicides	23	25.6
Mechanized equipments	15	16.7
Hand tools	53	58.9
Planting method		
Broadcasting	48	53.3
Dibbling/direct sowing	11	12.2
Drilling	12	13.4
Transplanting from nursery to the main field	19	21.1

***Multiple responses**

Post planting operation of the respondents

Thinning:

Table 3 shows that majority (87.8%) of the respondents did not practice thinning while the rest (12.2%) thinned their rice farm. Most of the respondents did not practice thinning which is the removal of extra seedlings from a stand on their rice farm probably because according to Uguru (1996), closer spacing of rice seeds will help to smother weeds and suppress tilling while wider spacing encourages tilling and more weed incidence.

Mulching:

Table 3 shows that about 97% of the respondents did not mulch while the rest (3.3%) mulched their rice farm. Mulching is an activity that involves use of green/vegetable matter to cover the top layer of soil in order to discourage weed growth or/and conserve water in the soil. Field observation shows that the majority cultivates on heavy clay soil because of their high water retaining capacity hence may not need mulch.

Fertilizer/manure Application:

Entries in Table 3 reveal that the majority (60%) of the respondent used NPK 20:10:10 to enrich their rice farm, 31.1% used urea, 18.9% used poultry dung manure, 6.7% applied piggery manure while 1.1% did not use any kind of fertilizer/manure to enrich rice farm. Field observation shows that farmers preferred use of inorganic manure as indicated by 91.1% of the respondents. This might be because of its efficient supply of required nutrient to the soil unlike the organic fertilizers. Further, Anup, Patel, Ramkrushna and Munda et. al.(2012) noted that

application of fertilizer in correct dose and amount are the prerequisites for getting optimum response in growth and management of pest and diseases in crops.

Weed management:

Data in Table 3 further reveal that majority (63.3%) of the respondents weeded their rice farm manually by using hand tools and by hand picking. Also, 38.9% of the respondents used herbicides, while 16.7% used mechanized equipments during weeding. This result is in agreement with the work of Anup, Patel, Ramkrushna, and Munda, et al. (2012) that noted that in North East India hand weeding is mostly practiced, but, in the absence of manpower, herbicides are been used.

The Table also shows that higher proportion (48.9%) of the respondents weeded their rice farm three times while 34.4% weeded twice per planting season. Thus, this majority (83.3%) that weeded their rice farm for about two to three times per planting season did this in accordance with ICS (2008) that recommended that rice should be weeded 2 to 3 times.

Harvesting processing and storage ::

Majority (80%) of the respondents harvested rice manually; 13.3% harvested both manually and mechanically (use of machines) while only 6.7% harvested with only machines (Table 3).

The table also indicates that majority (61.1%) of the respondents processed their produce immediately after harvest while the rest (38.9%) stored their produce for processing in future. This finding tends to suggest that the respondents were focused on minimizing food waste along

the supply chain by their acts of processing and storing of their harvested crops for future processing. According to FAO, about 1.3 billion tons per year or one-third of the edible food produced for human consumption is wasted along the food supply chain (Ostergren, 2015). Reduction of wasted food will help to feed the increasing population, decrease negative environmental impacts and improve resource efficiency and productivity.

Table 3: Post planting operations of the respondents

Post planting operations	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Thinning		
Yes	11	12.2
No	79	87.8
Mulching		
Yes	3	3.3
No	87	96.7
Type of fertilizer/manure*		
NPK 20:10:10	54	60
Urea	28	31.1
Piggery	6	6.7
Poultry	17	18.9
None	1	1.1
Method of weeding*		
Manual (hand tools)	57	63.3
Herbicides	35	38.9
Mechanized equipments (Rotary paddy weeder, e.g. Cono weeder or Japanese paddy weeder)	15	16.7
Number of weeding*		
None	3	3.3
1	5	5.6
2	31	34.4
3	44	48.9
4	7	7.8
Harvesting method		
Manual	72	80.0
Mechanized	6	6.7
Both	12	13.3
Processing and storage		
Process immediately after harvesting	55	61.1
Store for future use	35	38.9

* Multiple responses

Constraints to rice production

Entries in Table 4 reveal constraints to rice production as perceived by the respondents. These constraints were grouped into three basic component factors which include: problems associated with soil fertility and biotic stress; problems associated with farm-famer status and economic related problems. Variables that loaded under factor I (soil fertility and biotic stress) were: weeding problem (0.785), rodent attack (0.783), high incidence of pests and diseases (0.775), low soil fertility (0.692) and insufficient organic manure (0.685). Problems related to soil infertility and plant protection measures are among the most significant factors causing decrease in the yield of rice production. Pests and diseases as organisms that can cause stress to crops, affect them and have a serious impact on the economic output of a farm (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2013). The author further stated that farmers should vary their prevention and treatment methods depending on the crops they grow and the pests or diseases they are susceptible to, as they affect crops differently. Field sanitation and proper weed management are some of the measures that can reduce insect and pest problems in rice.

Malaria disease infection (0.814), other chronic disease (0.778), HIV/AIDS pandemic (0.705), marketing problems (0.537), Poor/lack of other infrastructural facilities like school, Hospital, water etc. (0.491), low interest in rice production (0.458), lack of technology/innovation on rice production (0.425) and ineffective extension service/poor extension agents -farmers' contact (0.491) were variables that loaded high under factor 2 (problems related to farm-famer status). Farmers' health status / manifestation of certain ailments like HIV/AIDS, malaria and other chronic diseases makes the farmers to be weak and unproductive and may result to decrease in his output and yield.

Under economic related problem (factors 3), lack of finance (0.666), difficulty in obtaining credit facilities (0.662), lack of collateral required to collect loan (0.601), scarcity of land for planting (0.495) and high cost of inorganic fertilizer (0.336) were variables that loaded high. Economic problems hinder the productivity of any enterprise including agricultural sector. This is because lack of fund or poverty hinders farmers from assessing agricultural inputs and utilization of these inputs on time sensitive rice production/agricultural matters for enhanced yield and income.

Table 4: constraints to rice production

Perceived constraints	Factor1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Scarcity of land planting	-0.244	0.243	0.495
Low soil fertility	0.692	0.015	0.039
Poor access road for transportation	-0.188	0.385	0.428
Lack of technical knowledge in the use of improved technology	-0.121	0.382	0.367
Lack/High cost of improved varieties	0.431	-0.087	0.323
Lack/High cost of inorganic fertilizer	0.023	0.171	0.336
Lack/Insufficient organic manure	0.685	0.270	-0.037
High cost/unavailability of agro-chemicals	0.179	-0.049	0.238
High cost/unavailability of other equipment e.g. farming implements, machines etc.	0.054	0.121	0.464
High cost/unavailability of labour to carry out the essential farming activities	0.309	-0.014	0.518
Labourious nature of rice production	0.345	0.010	0.562
Ineffective extension service/poor extension agent-famer's contact	0.095	0.419	0.258
High cost of processing	-0.486	0.442	0.294
Lack of finance/high interest rate on loan boost production	-0.203	0.029	0.666
Difficulties in obtaining credit facilities	-0.240	0.108	0.662
Lack of collateral required to collect loan	-0.130	-0.031	0.601
Problems associated with the importation of rice.	-0.427	0.490	-0.089
Rodents attack	0.783	-0.070	-0.196
Weeding problem	0.785	0.244	0.004
High incidence of pest and diseases infestation	0.775	0.158	0.102
Marketing problem	-0.275	0.537	0.061
Instability of the government policies	-0.563	0.524	-0.008
Low/poor interest in rice production	0.179	0.458	0.205
HIV/AIDS	0.243	0.705	0.070
Malaria	0.022	0.814	0.017

Other chronic disease	0.071	0.779	0.042
Climate change (e.g. shortage of rainfall, prolonged dry season etc.	0.492	0.318	-0.02
Poor/lack of other infrastructural facilities like school, Hospital, water etc.	0.002	0.491	-0.115
Lack of technology/innovation on rice production	-0.102	0.425	0.153

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Factor 1: Soil fertility and biotic stress; Factor 2: Farm-farmers' status and Factor 3: Economic related problems.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, it was obvious that the area experienced poor yield in rice production (1.4 t/ha) probably because they sourced their seeds from previously cultivated cultivars stored by them, did not practice irrigation and most of the respondents did not have access to tractor services. Economic related problems, soil and biotic stress and farm-farmers related problems were constraints to rice production in this area.

Recommendations

1. The study therefore recommends that rice farmers should adopt irrigation farming as well as effective soil conservation and management practices like relaying rice with legumes after farming for a long period, plough rice residues into the soil as organic matters so as to maintain the soil nutrient status that will encourage improved output and productivity.

2. Researchers/research institutes that are involved in rice breeding should develop high yielding rice varieties with farmers' and consumers preferred characteristics for appearance, time of maturity, taste among others. Agricultural extension agents should transfer the innovations to farmers and ensure that farmers adopt them through follow up and feed-back exercises/visits to

these farmers. This will help to boost output yield and income from rice production.

3. Government and Non Governmental Organisations should assist in provision of social amenities in the area especially hospitals with qualified personnel and necessary facilities so as to handle health challenges of these farmers. Improved health status of these farmers will surely culminate into increased productivity

References

- Adamu, S. (2012). Appraising Jonathan's Scorecard in Agriculture. *The Nigerian observer*. (29 May, 2012). Retrieved on 5/8/2013.
- Anup D, D.P. Patel, Ramkrushna G.I., G.C. Munda, S.V. Ngachan, B.U. Choudhury, K.P. Mohapatra, D.J. Rajkhowa, Rajesh K and A.S. Panwar (2012). Improved Rice Production Technology - for resource conservation and climate resilience (Farmers' Guide). Extension Bulletin No 78. ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Umiam – 793 103, Meghalaya.
- Atande, T. (2003). An overview of the Nigerian rice economy. The Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER), Ibadan – Nigeria.
- Aye, G.C. and Oboh, V.U. (2006). Resources use efficiency in rice production in Benue State, Nigeria: Implications for food Security and poverty alleviation in Farm Management. A paper presented at the 20th Annual National Conference in Technology and Agricultural Development in Nigeria. P.11
- Ayinde O. E; Adewumi, M.O; & Ojehomon, V.E.T. (2009). Determinants of technical efficiency and varietal-gap of Rice production in Nigeria: a meta-frontier model approach. *A Contributed Paper prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economists Conference, Beijing, China, August 16-22, 2009.*
- Chukwu, P.C. (2003). Gender roles and returns in rice cropping pattern in Aninri Local Government Area of Enugu State. Unpublished project of the Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Daramola, B. (2005). Government policy and competitiveness of Nigeria rice economy. A paper presented at the workshop on rice policy and food security in Sub-Sahara Africa, organized by WARDA Cotonou, Benin.

- David, T.A. and Terwase, S. (2011). Efficiency of Resource use in Rice Farming Enterprise in Kwande Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 1 No. 3; Pp: 215-220.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2013) Guidance: Pests and diseases in combinable crops. How to recognise symptoms of common diseases in combine machine harvested crops, and prevent and control them with effective treatments.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-environment-food-rural-affairs>
- Farinde, A.J and Alabi, O.S (2015) Application of principal component analysis and exploratory factor analysis in Agricultural Extension Research (ed.) Madukwe, M.C *A Guide to Research in Agricultural Extension*. Publication of Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria 271-280.
- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), (2000). Agriculture towards 2015/30 Technical Interim Report, April, 2000, Rome.
- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), (2001). FAO Rice Conference 2001. Accessed Online at www.fao.org On 23rd July, 2007.
- Igbokwe, E.M. (2000). Ownership and task in rice cropping patterns in the Awgu Low land, Nigeria. *Journal of Home Economics Research*, 3, pp. 10-17.
- Information and Communication Support System (ICS), for Agricultural growth in Nigeria, (2008). Growing upland land in Nigeria. *Crop production series*. Retrieved from www.nternet.org/report.aspx/report.
- International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), (2001). Rice Statistics. Accessed Online at <http://oryza.com/africa/nigeria/index.shtml> on 27th July, 2007.
- International Rice Research Institute (IRRI). (2006). *Bringing hope, improving lives: Strategic Plan 2007–2015*. Manila .61 p.
- Kutte, B.T. & Tya, T.S.K. (2000). Mechanization strategies for sustainable agricultural engineering in E.O. Akubuo (eds.). Proceedings of the international conference of annual general meeting. Nigeria Association of Agricultural Engineer
- Longtau, S. R. (2003). Nigeria case study report on rice production. Multi-agency partnerships for Technical change in West African agriculture (MAPS). Jos, Nigeria: Eco-systems development organization (EDO) for Overseas development institute (ODI) (www.odi.org.uk/rpeg/maps/nigeria.pdf).
- National Population Commission (NPC) (2014). Population figure, Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja. Retrieved May 2, 2014 from <http://www.npc.gov>
- Norman, J.C. & Kebe, B (2006). African smallholder farmers: Rice production and sustainable livelihoods. Retrieved online from <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/projects>.

379
380 Odigbo, E.O. and Onwualu, A.P. (1994). Mechanization of Agriculture in Nigeria. Journal of
381 Agricultural Technology, 2. Pp 8.
382
383 Okoruwa, V.O. & Ogundele, O.O (2004). Technical Efficiency Differentials in Rice Production
384 Technologies in Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Department of Agricultural
385 Economics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
386
387 Ostergren, K . (2015). Conference theme of the 2nd International conference on Global Food
388 Security to be held at Ithaca, NY, USA on 11-14 October 2015.
389
390 Uguru, M.I. (1996). Crop production tools, techniques and practice. Nsuka: Falladu publishing
391 company.