Economy
ISSN: 2313-8181
Vol. 1, No. 3, 79-88, 2014
www.asianonlinejournals.com/index.php/Economy

Evaluation of Third National Fadama Development Programme (Fadama 111) on Poverty Reduction in Rural Communities of Buruku Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria

Apesughur Dominic Achiv[1] --- Idoma Kim[2*] --- Ashiki Godwin Masin[3] --- Ibrahim Umaru Abdullahi[4]

[1,2,4]Department of Geography, Faculty of Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria Nigeria
[3]Department of Geography, Nassarawa College of Education, Akwanga, Nigeria

Abstract

Fadama111 is a World Bank assisted programme designed to reduce poverty in the rural areas of Nigeria. The objective of the programme is to sustainably increase the incomes of fadama users. By increasing their incomes the programme would help reduce rural poverty, increase food security and contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal (MDG). The objectives of this study are to; examine status of the benefiting rural communities in the study area, assess the impact of the Fadama111 programme on the beneficiary community members' livelihood activities and socio-economic development in the study area, identify constraints to effective intervention of Fadama111 programme in the study area. The method of data collection was the use of questionnaire, personal observation and structural interview. All the five funded FCAs and thirty three fadama user groups (FUGs) in the study area were selected as sample frame. 380 respondents were purposively chosen as sample size for this study. The questionnaire was administered to ten respondents in each FCA and FUG. Performance index and satisfactory level were the measurement variables. Descriptive techniques were used for data analysis. The conclusion was that Fadama111 programme did not improve the condition of members of the benefiting communities especially in the area of food production. Corrupt practices such as embezzlements and mismanagement of funds by both rural and state management officials of Fadama111 programme, untimely and inadequate supply of inputs and difficulties of member communities to pay counterpart funds were major constraints to effective implementation of Fadama111 programme in the study area.

Keywords: Rural, Poverty, Participation, Sustainability, Empowerment, Evaluation, Fadama, Nigeria.

Contents

** Corresponding Author*

1. Introduction

The reduction of poverty is universally accepted as a primary development objective. Poverty is a vicious circle which keeps the poor in a state of destitution. The concept of poverty is multi-dimensional in nature. Poverty according to Kankwenda *et al.* (2000),Robb (2002),UNDP (1994) and Kwaghe (2006) is multi-dimensional, because it affects many aspects of the human condition, including physical, moral and psychological. For many societies, poverty is a concrete phenomenon and can easily be identified. It is also relative because the population that may be classified as poor in developed countries could be regarded as materially well off in least developed countries. Each society as pointed out by Agumagu (2000) defined poverty in its own terms. Conventional measures of poverty count the number of people below the poverty line and define the poverty rate as the proportion of total population below the poverty line. Poverty, according to him, is therefore, a normative concept and setting the poverty level requires a judgment about social norms. Therefore, irrespective of how poverty is defined, the poor have been described as those who could not obtain adequate income, find stable job, own property or maintain healthy condition (Obadan, 1997), they also lack adequate level of education and cannot satisfy their basic needs (Ebenehi et al., 2012). Thus, the poor are often illiterate, live in poor condition of health and have short life spans (World Bank, 1996).Moreover, they have no access to basic necessities of life; lack skills and gainful employment, Possess fewer economic assets and sometimes lack self esteem (Ajayi, 2009).Concurringly, (Joseph, 2005) submitted that the poor are those with income below the poverty line, who lack access to basic services, practical contacts and other forms of support. They can also be seen as people isolated in rural areas and the marginal urban zones where essential infrastructure are lacking. Admittedly, The rural areas of the world particularly those of the developing countries have their unique identity. The rural areas are at disadvantageous positions when comparison is made between the urban and the rural areas. For instance, the rural communities generally have low population size and low density, poor infrastructural facilities, poor education, poor housing qualities and they produce more primary products (Ehisuoria, 2012).

It is important to note that Nigeria is gripped by both income and food poverty, and poor access to the means of supporting rural development (FGN/WHO, 2004).Outstandingly, poverty in Nigeria has been described as widespread and severe (World Bank, 1996). The Federal Office of Statistics/World Bank in their analysis of the poverty trend in Nigeria noted that poor families are in higher proportion in farming household and are mainly in the rural areas (Adeolu and Taiwo, 2004). Accordingly, Nigeria is faced with the challenge of providing adequate food supply for its teaming population of about 140 million. Similarly, Food and Agricultural Organization has consistently listed Nigeria among countries that are technically unable to meet their food needs from rain-feed agriculture at low level inputs. Lamentably, the devastating effect of desertification and drought in the last three decades on the dry sub-humid and semi-arid agro-ecological zones of Nigeria have made the Nigerian government to embark on massive investment in small-holder irrigation (Adeolu and Taiwo, 2004).Hence, the goal of increasing food production and reducing food import has elicited many programmes and policies at the various level of government. For example, in 1993, the federal government of Nigeria in collaboration with the World Bank and State government started a new programme referred to as the National Fadama Development programme. The First National Fadama Development Programme (Fadama I) is a World Bank assisted programme designed to promote simple and low cost improved irrigation technology. The widespread adoption of the technologies enabled farmers to increase production. Federal government impressed by the achievements, approached the African Development Fund (ADF) of the African Development Bank (ADB) for support in expanding the achievement of Fadama in scope and size. This led to the formation of fadama II programme (Agbarevo and Okwoche, 2014).

Fadama II programme was implemented in 17 states and Federal Capital Territory between 2004 to February 2009. The programme adopted community driven development Approach with extensive participation of the stakeholders at early stage of the programme cycle. This approach was in line with African Development Bank policies and development strategies for Nigeria which emphasizes poverty reduction to beneficiary participation (Ker, 2008).

However, Fadama III programme is a follow-up of fadama II programme, which covers the remaining nineteen states of the country with 380 local government areas that did not participate in fadama II programme (Agbarevo and Okwoche, 2014).

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The objective of the Fadama III programme is to sustainably increase the incomes of fadama users. By increasing their incomes, the programme would reduce rural poverty, increase food security and contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal (MDGs). Its target beneficiaries are the private economic sector or those who indirectly benefits from the exploitation of the natural resources in a given fadama area.

In each benefiting community, people form groups known as fadama users groups (FUGs) with membership of between 10-20 people to participate in Fadama111 activities. In each community, all the FUGs have to formally come together, democratically elect members among them to form a body to be known as fadama community association (FCA).This serves as apex body overseeing the activities of all fadama user groups in that rural community (Agbarevo and Okwoche, 2014).The programme would empower the fadama community associations (FCAs) with resources, the needed training and technical assistance or support to properly manage and control these resources for their own development. The FCAs would take charge of their own destiny through real empowerment. It would also adopt a socially inclusive and participatory process whereby all fadama users would collectively identify their development priorities and agree on their investment activities which would be outlined in a community development plan. initiallyIn Benue State the fadama III programme started disbursement of money to beneficiaries on 23rd March 2009 with twenty participating local government areas, these were; Agatu, Buruku, Gboko, Gwer, Gwer-west, Katsina-Ala, Konshisha, Kwande, Logo, Makurdi, Ogbadibo, Oju, Okpokwo, Otukpo, Tarka, Ukum, Ushongo and Vandeiky Primarily, the major thrust of Fadama III programme is to practically demonstrate the concept of community driven development in line with the emerging paradigm of bottom-to-top approach in rural development. Thus,Fadama111 programme is to serve as facilitator to the benefiting communities

in achieving the programme objective such as infrastructural investment (feeder roads rehabilitation, culverts, drifts, stock routes, grazing reserves etc, market infrastructure (toilets, boreholes, warehouses, stores etc), pilot assets acquisition (water pumps, watering cans, tube well and sprinklers for irrigation, fishing traps, canoes, agro processing equipment, oil processors, rice threshers and processors, garri processing equipment, groundnut dehiscing, honey collection and processing equipment, soap production etc).Thus, with a special arrangement, the beneficiary would pay 10% of the total cost (known as counterpart funds) while the balance of 90% would be paid by the programme. For Input support like seeds and seedlings, Veterinary drugs for livestock, feeds and fingerlings, herbicides etc. the beneficiary would pay 30% of the total cost while the programme would pay the balance of 70%.

Notably, in Buruku L.G.A., fadama III programme started disbursement of funds to beneficiaries in 2011.In view of the foregoing, the researchers intend to assess the impact of fadama III programme in improving benefiting rural community members in Buruku local government area, Benue State(2011-2013 intervention period).

1.3 Aim

The aim of this study is to assess the performance of fadama III programme interms of improvement of the beneficiary member communities' livelihood activities and socio-economic development of the study area.

1.4 Objectives

The objectives of this study are to;

i. Examine the socio -economic status of the benefiting rural communities in the study area.
ii. Assess the impact of fadama III programme on the livelihood activities and socio-economic development of the benefiting communities in the study area.
iii. Identify constraints to effective intervention of fadama III programme in the study area.

1.5 Study Area

1.5.1 Location

Buruku Local Government Area (L.G.A.) is located between latitude $7^{o}5'00''$ North and longitude $8^{o}56'00''$ and $9^{o}20'00''$ East. It shares boundaries with Logo L.G.A to the north, Katsina-Ala LGA to the east, Ushongo L.G.A to the south, Gboko L.G.A. to the west and Tarka L.G.A. to the north-west.

1.5.2 Climate and Drainage

Mean annual rainfall in the area ranges between 150-180mm. The L.G.A. experience two main seasons; dry and wet season. The wet season starts from April and last till October while the dry season lasts from November to March. Buruku L.G.A. falls within the Koppen's Aw (wet and dry) climate type. The rains are usually intense and torrential sometimes accompanied by storms. Temperature is mostly high throughout the year ranging between $23^{o}C$-$28^{o}C$ with a peak of about $35^{o}C$. The coolest part of the season is around the harmattan period between December and February.

The major river in the L.G.A. is river Katsina-Ala and other smaller rivers. The L.G.A. lies in the guinea savannah vegetation of typical grassland.

1.5.3 People and Socio-Economic Activities

The L.G.A. is inhabited by the Tiv people who are farmers. There are other ethnic groups like Etulo and Abakwa who engage in both cropping and fishing activities.

2. Methodology

A reconnaissance survey was carried out in order to have in depth knowledge of the activities of fadama III programme in the study area.

2.1. Data Needed for the Study

The data needed for this study were: data on socio-economic status of the respondents, data on projects of fadama III programme,impact of Fadama111programme on the benefiting communities and data on constraints to effective implementation of fadama III programme.

2.2. Data Collection

The methods of data collection for this study are questionnaire, personal observation and structural interview. The questionnaire is divided into three sections namely; status of the respondents, impact of the programme on the livelihood activities and socio-economic development of the benefiting communities, constraints to fadama III programme activities and recommendations for improvement of fadama III programme in the study area.

2.3. Source of Data

For this research work, both primary and secondary sources were used.

2.4. Sample Frame and Sampling Technique

Fadama III programme have been implemented in five Fadama Community Associations (FCAs) and thirty three Fadama User Groups (FUGs) in Buruku L.G.A. All the funded FCAs and FUGs have been chosen as sample frame for this study. However, 380 respondents were selected as sample size. This constitutes 50% of the total population of the benefiting member communities in the study area. Structurally, fadama III programme, is expected to have a membership of twenty people per FCA and FUG. Purposive methods have been used for sample size selection. Ten questionnaires were administered in each fadama community association and fadama user group.

2.5. Measurement of Variables

Performance index was determined by asking the respondents to indicate the actual quantity of hectares of land cultivated and crop yields in kilogrammes. The beneficiaries are to rate in qualitative terms, their level of satisfaction, using a three point likert type scale ranging from highly satisfactory 1: moderate satisfactory 2; and not satisfied 3.

3. Findings

3.1. Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The age distribution of the samples respondents shows that, those between 21-25 were 6%(21), those between 26-30 were 23%(87), those between 31-35 were 24% (91), those between 36-40 were 29% (111), those between 41-45 were 15% (60) and those between 46-50 were 3%(10) (Table 1).This implies that majority(68%) of the respondents were youths(31-45 years).

Table-1. Age of Sampled Respondents in the Study Area

Age group	Respondents	Percentages
21 – 25	21	6
26 – 30	87	23
31 – 35	91	24
36 – 40	111	29
41 – 45	60	15
46 – 50	10	3
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' field work, 2014.

3.2. Sex Distribution of Respondents

On the pattern of sex distribution, 53 %(200) were male while 47 %(180) were female (table 2).Table 2 has also revealed that the gender disparity in the study area is moderately low.

Table-2. Sex distribution of sampled respondent in the study area

Sex	Respondents	Percentages
Male	200	53
Female	180	47
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.3. Education of the Sampled Respondents

Concerning education of the sampled respondents, non-formal education 54%(208), those with primary education were 29%(111), those with post-primary education were 13%(50), those with NCE, OND qualification were 1%(3), those with vocational education were 2%(6) and those with university degree were 1%(2) (table 3). This indicates that illiteracy level of the respondents is relatively high and this could impede reception to positive changes.

Table-3. Educational attainment of sampled respondents in the study area

Educational attainment	Respondents	Percentages
Non-formal education	208	54
Primary education	111	29
Post primary education	50	13
N.C.E., OND	3	1
Vocational Education	6	2
University degree	2	1
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.4. Occupation of the Sampled Respondents

Out of 380 sampled respondents, 92%(351) were farmers, 1%(4) were civil servants, 1%(5) were traders, 3%(10) were artisans and 3%(10) were other categories of occupations,(table 4). This has shown clearly that the benefiting communities in Buruku LGA is an agrarian community. Hence, Fadama programme if properly implemented would benefit them immensely.

Table-4. Occupation of Sampled respondents in the study area

Occupation	Respondents	Percentages
Farmer	351	92
Civil servant	4	1
Trader	5	1
Artisan	10	3
Others	10	3
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

Impact of Fadama111on the Livelihood Activities of the Benefiting Community Members and Socio-Economic Development of the study area.

3.5. Rice Processing Projects

Concerning the rice processing projects, Mbaapen fadama community association and Etulo Fadama community association (FCA) chose rice processing as their priority project, table 5.

Table-5. Rice Processing Machine in the Study Area

S/N	Community	No. of machine	Execution
1.	Mbaapen	1	Completed
2.	Etulo	1	Completed

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

A sampled of twenty respondents was carried out to determine the level of satisfaction of rice processing machines in the study area. The breakdown of the respondents was: 40 %(8) of respondents were highly satisfactory, 35 %(7) were moderately satisfactory and 25 %(5) were not satisfied, table 6. This implies that the benefiting communities in Buruku LGA were greatly impacted by the programme, for the reason that 75% indicated they were satisfied.

Table-6. Level of Satisfaction of processing machine

Satisfaction level	Respondents	Percentage
Highly satisfactory	8	40
Moderately satisfactory	7	35
Not satisfied	5	25
Total	20	100

Source: Author's field work, 2014.

3.6. Market Stall Project

Mbaya Fadama community association (FCA) was the only fadama III programme benefiting community that selected market stall as their development project in the study area; table 7.

Table-7. Construction of market stall in the study area

S/No.	Community	No. of block	No. of rooms	Execution
1.	Mbaya	1	6	Completed

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

On assessment of satisfactory level on market store in the study area 70 %(7) of the sampled respondents were highly satisfactory, 20% (2) said moderately satisfactory and 10 %(1) said not satisfied (table 8). Table 8 has further shown that Fadama programme had great impact on the benefiting communities in Buruku LGA through the construction of market store. Only 10% of the respondents signified they were satisfied.

Table-8. Satisfactory level on market store in the study Area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Highly satisfactory	7	70
Moderately satisfactory	2	20
Not satisfied	1	10
Total	10	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.7. Warehouse Projects

It is not always possible to produce good as at when required. Production is usually done ahead of consumption for various reasons. Thus, there is need for warehousing and storage facilities. Atiikyaa fadama community association and Bineu fadama community association chose warehouse as their intervention project. (Table 9).

Table-9. Warehouse project in the study area

S/No.	Community	No. of Block	Execution
1.	Atiikyau	1	Completed
2.	Bineu	1	Completed

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

On the whole twenty respondents were sampled on assessment of warehouse in the study area. The breakdown of the responses was 80 %(16) of the sampled respondents said moderately satisfactory while 20 %(4) were not satisfied (table 10).Table 10 portrays that the impact of Fadama 111 programme on the benefiting communities in Buruku LGA regarding warehouse project was relatively high for the fact that only 20% of the respondents were not satisfied.

Table-10. Assessment of Satisfactory Level on warehouse project in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	16	80
Not satisfied	4	20
Total	20	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.8. Rice Production

On the rice production Atsozi fadama user group (FUG), EtuloBrande FUG and Ogilazi FUG in Etulo fadama community association (FCA); Mbagbagh FUG, Angbo/bar in Mbaya FCA; Mbatsaese FUG in Mbaapen FCA; Anyol FUG, and Dajo FUG in Atiikyaa and Wuav rice FUG in Binev fadama community association chose rice cultivation as their priority project, table 11.

Table-11. Rice Production 2011-2013 in the Study Area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Etudo	Atsozi	-	-	20	-	-	2000
2.		EtuloBranda	-	-	20	-	-	2100
3.		Ogilazi	-	-	20	-	-	1800
4.	Mbaya	Mbagbagh	17	18	19	400	700	1200
5.		Mngbo/Bar	17	18	19	500	600	800
6.	Mbaapen	Mbatsaese	15	14	13	400	500	200
7.	Atiikyaa	Anyol	-	20	20	-	1200	1400
8.		Dajo	-	18	18	-	1000	1200
9.	Binev	Wuav Rice	16	14	12	400	300	300

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014.

Out of the 90 sampled respondents, 7 %(6) said the quantity of the harvested rice is moderately satisfactory while 93 %(84) of the sampled respondents were not satisfied, table 12. In addition, table 12 has revealed that Fadama 111 benefited the communities in the study area immensely through rice production; only 7% of the entire population indicated not satisfied.

Table-12. Assessment of satisfactory level on rice production in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	6	7
Not satisfied	84	93
Total	90	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.9. Groundnut Production

Mbanor fadama user group (FUG) in Mbaya fadama community association; Mbatsaase fadama user group (FUG), Mbaagir FUG and Mbaagir II FUG in Mbaapen fadama community association (FCA) and Wuav G/nut FUG in Biev FCA chose groundnut production as their intervention project, table 13.

Table-13. Groundnut Production 2011-2013 in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Mbaya	Mbanor	6	5	5	700	700	500
2.	Mbaapen	Mbatsaase	5	3	3	400	200	400
3.		Mbaagir I	4	4	3	500	300	200
4.		Mbaagir II	4	4	4	300	200	400
5	Binev	Wuav G/nut	5	4	4	200	300	400

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

Assessment of the satisfactory level of groundnut production in the study area show that, 6% (3) of the sampled respondents were moderately satisfactory and 94 %(47) were not satisfied, (table 14). Also, table 14 portrays that Fadama 111 had low impact on the beneficiary communities with regards to groundnut production as 94% of the respondents indicated not satisfied.

Table-14. Assessment of Groundnut Production in the study Area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	3	6
Not satisfied	47	94
Total	50	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.10. Soybeans Production

Concerning soybean production in the study area, Mbaghagh fadama user group (FUG) in Mbaya Fadama community association (FCA); Mbaadatso FUG in Atiikyaa FCA and Wuavsoyb FUG in Binev FCA chose soybeans production, (table 15).

Table-15. Soybeans production 2011-2013 in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Mbaya	Mbaghagh	15	14	15	600	550	500
2.	Atiikyaa	Mbaadatso	14	14	14	500	400	450
3.	Binev	Wuavsoyb	12	12½	12	250	200	200

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

On the satisfactory level of soybeans production in the study area, 100 % (30) of the sample respondents were not satisfied with improvement of soyabeans by fadama III programme in the study area(table 16).Moreover, table 16 reveals that Fadama 111 could not improve on soya bean production in the beneficiary communities.

Table-16. Assessment of soybeans production in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Not satisfied	30	100
Total	30	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.11. Yam Production

On yam production, Angi fadama user group (FUG) in Atiikyaa fadama community association (FCA); Mbanor-Abera FUG in Mbaya FCA and Otsitzi FUG in Etulo FCA chose yam production as their intervention project in the study area, table 17.

Table-17. Yam production 2011-2013 in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Atiikyaa	Angi	12	13	13	400	600	650
2.	Mbaya	Mbanor-Abera	12	12½	13	500	500	700
3.	Etulo	Otsitzi	-	-	14	-	-	1500

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

Out of 30 sampled respondents 13 % (4) were moderately satisfactory with the production of yam in the study area, while 87% (26) were not satisfied, table 18. Table 18 has reveals poor performance of Fadama111on yam production in the study area.

Table-18. Assessment of Yam production in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	4	13
Not satisfied	26	87
Total	30	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.12. Production of Mellon

Ortese fadama user group (FUG) in Mbaya fadama community association (FCA) and Mbatsaase FUG in Mbaapen FCA selected production of mellon as their intervention project in the study area, table 19.

Table-19. Production of Mellon 2011-2013 in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Mbaya	Ortese	12 ½	13	13	300	350	350
2.	Mbaapen	Mbatsaase	12	12	12	200	150	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

Out of the total sampled respondents 100% (20) were not satisfied with the intervention in the study area, table 20. Table 20 portrays poor performance of Fadama111 on the production of Mellon.

Table-20. Assessment of Mellon production in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Not satisfied	20	100
Total	20	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.13. Millet Production

Ugye fadama user group in Etulo fadama community association is the only user group in the study area that chose millet production as their intervention project, table 21.

Table-21. Millet production 2013 in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Etulo	Ugye	-	-	14	-	-	600

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

Sampled of 10 respondents was carried out to assessed millet yield. The results show that 20% (2) were moderately satisfactory, while 80 % (8) respondents were not satisfied table 21. Table 21 again revealed poor performance of Fadama 111 regarding millet production as 80% of the respondents indicated not satisfied.

Table-22. Assessment of millet production in the study Area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentage
Moderately satisfactory	2	20
Not satisfied	8	80
Total	10	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.14. Cassava Production

On cassava production, Etulo widows fadama user, Otsefadama user group (FUG) in Etulo fadama community association (FCA); Mbaju FUC in Mbaya FCA and Akongu FUG, Dooshima FUG in Atiikyaa Fadama community association chose production of cassava, table 22.

Table-23. Cassava production 2011-2013 in the Study Area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Etulo	Etulo widows	-	-	14 ½	-	-	1500
2.		Otse	-	-	15	-	-	1700
3.	Mbaya	Mbaju	14	15	15	1000	1400	1500
4.	Atiikyaa	Akongu	13	15	15	700	1300	1500
5		Dooshina	14	15	15	800	1600	1500

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

On the level of satisfaction on cassava production, 100 %(50) of the sampled respondents were moderately satisfactory, table 23.Table 24 shows further that Fadama 111 has greatly improved the production of cassava as the entire respondents i.e. 100% indicated moderate satisfaction.

Table-24. Assessment of Cassava production in the Study Area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	50	100
Total	50	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.15. Guinea Corn Production

Kaaku widows fadama user group (FUG) in Atiikyaa fadama community association (FCA); Mbatsaase FUG, Mbaagir I G/nut FUG, Mbaagir II G/nut FUG in Mbaapen FCA and Mbanor G/nut FUG in mbaya fadama community association chose guinea corn production as their project in the study area. Table 24.

Table-25. Guinea corn production in the study area

S/N	FCA	FUG	Hectares of Land cultivated and year			Quantity harvested in kilogrammes and year		
			2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
1.	Atiikyaa	Kaaku widows	15	15	15	1000	1100	1300
2.	Mbaapen	Mbatsaase	13	14	13 ½	500	600	500
3.		Mbaagir I G/nut	14	14	13	400	500	400
4.		Mbaagir II G/nut	14	14	14	500	600	500
5	Mbaya	Mabanor G/nut	15	16	16 ½	1400	1600	1500

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

On the whole 50 respondents was assessed on satisfactory level of guinea corn production the result was that, 20%(10) of the sampled respondents rate the production as moderately satisfactory while 80% (40) were not satisfied, table 25.Table 26 further portrays that Fadama111 did not have significant impact on the production of Guinea corn as only 20% of the respondents were moderately satisfied.

Table-26. Assessment of Guinea corn production in the study area

Satisfactory level	Respondents	Percentages
Moderately satisfactory	10	20
Not satisfied	40	80
Total	50	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.16. Constraints to Fadama III Programme in the Study Area.

3.16.1. Financial Constraints

On financial constraints 350 respondents were sampled. The breakdown of the responses were 13.1 % (50) said mismanagement of money by community project management committee, 26.3%(100) said inadequate capital to execute the projects, 26.3%(100) said untimely release of money from the state fadama coordination office to rural beneficiary and 34.2%(130) said corrupt practices by the programme managers, table 27.Table 27 further depicts that corruption is the bane of poor performance of Fadama 111 since 34% of the respondents indicated it.

Table-27. Financial constraints to effective intervention of fadama III programme in the study area

Constraints	Respondents	Percentages
Mismanagement of money by fadama III Programme rural community project management committee	50	13.1
Inadequate capital to execute the projects	100	26.3
Untimely release of money by the state coordination office to beneficiary	100	26.3
Corrupt practices by the programme managers	130	34.2
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.17. Constraints Arising from Inputs

On constraints relating to inputs, 50%(190) sampled respondents said untimely supply of inputs to beneficiaries by the state coordination office. While 50%(190) were of the opinion that inadequate supply of inputs was the main constraints(Table 28).

Table-28. Constraints arising from inputs in the study area

Constraints	Respondents	Percentages
Untimely supply of input	190	50
Inadequate supply of inputs	190	50
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.17.1. Constraints from the Fadama III Programme Benefiting Communities

On the constraints relating to fadama III programme benefiting communities in the study area, 100%(380) of the sampled respondents said difficulty to members of fadama communities to pay counterpart funds. (Table 29).

Table-29. Constraints from the benefiting communities in the study area

Constraints	Respondents	Percentages
Difficulty to member of fadama communities to pay counterpart fund	380	100
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

3.18. Rural Community Comments for Effective Implementation of Fadama III Programme in the Study Area

On the whole 380 respondents were sampled on community recommendations. The breakdown of the sampled respondents were as follow: 19%(68) said payment of counterpart funds should be encouraged to fadama communities by way of contributing small amount of money by members, 23%(90) said adequate funds should allocate to projects for proper execution by the beneficiary communities, 23%(89) said timely release of money and inputs and 35%(133) said appointment of good leaders should be encouraged to all organizations. Table 30.

Table-30. Rural community suggestions for effective implementation of fadama III programme in the study Area

Suggestions	Respondents	Percentages
Fadama communities should be encouraged to Pay counterpart fund through donations	68	19
Adequate funds should allocated to projects for proper execution	90	23
Timely release of money and input	89	23
Appointment of good leaders should be encouraged	133	35
Total	380	100

Source: Authors' Field Work, 2014

4. Conclusion

From the findings, 4%(15) of the total sampled respondents were highly satisfactory with the activities of fadama III programme on poverty reduction, 26%(100) were moderately satisfactisfied and 70%(265) were not satisfied.

Generally speaking, fadama III programme did not improve the condition of members of the benefiting communities especially in the area of food production. In addition, corrupt practices such as embezzlements and mismanagement of funds by both rural and state management officials of fadama III programme, untimely and inadequate supply of inputs and difficulties of member communities to pay counterpart funds were major constraints to effective implementation of fadama III programme in the study area.

5. Recommendations

Based on the major findings, the following recommendations are made:

i. Government is to give zero tolerance to corrupt practices to ensure effective utilization of funds.
ii. There should be timely and adequate provisions of fadama inputs and infrastructures like fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides etc since agricultural operations are time –bound.
iii. Government should ensure improved technologies to for storage, transportation, processing and marketing of fadama produce.
iv. Project farmers should be encouraged to participate actively in the FUAs via trainings and consistent payment of counterpart fund.

References

Adeolu, B.A. and A. Taiwo, 2004. The impact of national fadama facility in alleviating rural poverty and enhancing agricultural development in South-Western Nigeria. Journal of Social Science, 9(3): 157-161.

Agbarevo, M.N.B. and A.V. Okwoche, 2014. Evaluation of effect of the third national fadama development project (Fadama 111) on food production among farmers in Kwande local government area of Benue State, Nigeria. European Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Research, 2(2): 27-32.

Agumagu, A.C., 2000. Poverty alleviation in Nigeria: Can agricultural extension help? In: Agbamu ,J.U. (ed.) (2009); Perspectives in agricultural extension and rural development. Lagos: Springfield PublishersLtd. pp: 345.

Ajayi, A.R., 2009. The role expectation agricultural extension in poverty alleviation in democratic and deregulated economy. In: Perspectives in agricultural extension and rural development, J.U.Agbamu (ed.). Lagos: Springfield Publishers Ltd.

Ebenehi, O., N.M. Saddiq, O. Oyinbo, A.A. Muhammad and J.O. Ichi, 2012. Impact of the national poverty eradication programme (NAPEP) on rural livelihood in Kogi State,Nigeria. Sokoto Journal of the Social Sciences, 2(1): 26-36.

Ehisuoria, S.E., 2012. The role of non-agro based industries in rural development in Esan Land. Edo State, Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis Department of Geography and Regional Planning. Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma.

FGN/WHO, 2004. Millennium development goals report. Abuja: FGN/WHO.

Joseph, I.O., 2005. An assessment of impacts of poverty reduction programme in Nigeria as development strategy. PhD Dissertation,St. Clement University of Turks Caicoos, Island.

Kankwenda, M., L. Gregoire, H. Legros and H. Ouedraogo, 2000. Poverty eradication; where stands Africa? London: UNDP. Economical Limited.

Ker, J., 2008. General overview of Fadama III programme. State programme coordinator. A Publication of Communication and Information Support Unit Benue State Fadama Coordination Office, Makurdi, Printed by Vital Gate Ltd.

Kwaghe, P.V., 2006. Poverty profile and its determinants among farming household in Bomo State Nigeria. In: Department of Agricultural Economics. University of Maiduguri, Borno States, Nigeria.

Obadan, M.O., 1997. Analytical framework for poverty reduction: Issues of economic growth versus other strategies. In: Proceedings of the Nigerian Economic Society's Annual Conference. pp: 1-18.

Robb, C., 2002. Can the poor influence policy? Participatory poverty assessment in the developing world. Washington,D.C.: The World Bank. pp: 1-27.

UNDP, 1994. United nations development programme. Sustainable Human Development and Agriculture, UNDP Guidebook Series UNDP New York: 48.

World Bank, 1996. Nigeria: Poverty in the most of plant, the challenge of growth with inclusion. A world bank poverty assessment. Washington D.C: World Bank.