Lafia Journal of Economics and Management Sciences: Volume 7, Issue 1; 2022
ISSN: 2550-732X
Published by Department of Economics, Federal University of Lafia, Nigeria

Assessment of Agricultural Policies and Intervention Programmes in Niger State, Nigeria

Abdullahi Yunusa
Department of Democracy and Governance, National Institute for Legislative and Democratic Studies, National Assembly, Abuja, Nigeria
Corresponding Email: yunusaabdullahi@ymail.com

Abstract
Liberal arguments hold that any form of state intervention in agriculture is an encumbrance of agricultural productivity. Thus, they recommend the privatization of agriculture and the total withdrawal of the state from agriculture. This study aims to contribute to the theoretical perspective of whether or not the state should intervene in agriculture. The study examined the effects of agricultural policies and intervention programmes on agriculture productivity and economic growth of Niger State, Nigeria. The study relied on secondary data and used developmental state theory to achieve its objective. The study found that state intervention and support from development partners had a positive effect on agricultural productivity and economic growth of Niger State. Consequent to state intervention, there was an increased mean farm yield production in maize, rice, sorghum, cassava, yam, groundnut, and other major crops. The study further found increased livestock production of quality animals, especially cattle, goats, sheep, and poultry. The increase in agricultural productivity had a multiplier effect on the economic growth of Niger State. The contribution of agriculture to Niger State GDP and IGR increased consistently between 2013 and 2020. Based on these findings, the study recommends that Niger State Government should conceive a well-designed agricultural policy and intervention programme that will address the shortfall in national food supply and meet the raw material requirements of local industries in Nigeria. In addition, Niger State Government should vigorously pursue automation of its revenue collection system in the agricultural sector to increase its IGR.

Keywords: Agricultural Policy, Agriculture, Economic Growth, Sustainable Development, Development
JEL Classification: Q18, Q1, O4, Q01, O2

1. Introduction

Agriculture is perceived as the most critical sector that holds potential for the future economic development of Nigeria, as it did in the

First Republic (Kenny, 2019). Indeed, agriculture is central to the development of Nigeria and has been a source of livelihood for a large population of Nigerians. From the colonial era to the early 1970s, the agricultural sector has played an important role in Nigeria's economy (Mkandawire & Bourenane, 1987). Agriculture supported food security, employment generation, poverty reduction, revenue generation, foreign exchange earnings, and Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Nigeria was, therefore, an agricultural merchant state that depended on surpluses extracted from agriculture as revenue.

The discovery and gains from crude oil in Nigeria led to the neglect of agriculture and the subsequent food crisis that became manifest in the early 1970s (Organization of African Unity [OAU], 1981; Aribisala, 1983; Hansen, 1987). This food crisis signalled a failure of the market mechanism in the efficient management of agriculture in Nigeria. For this reason, the federal and state governments in Nigeria took on developmental functions by initiating policies of active intervention in agriculture to address the structural inadequacies in the sector. The successes recorded through the intervention programmes under the three national development plans of 1970 to 1974, 1975 to 1980, and 1981 to 1985 convinced stakeholders responsible for agricultural development in Nigeria that state intervention is essential to address Nigeria's food crisis (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development [FMARD], 1985; Iwuchukwu & Igbokwe, 2012).

In Niger State, the government recognizes that agriculture is the backbone of its economy due to its many advantages over other states in Nigeria. Therefore, successive administrations in the State, both military and civilian, have sought to tap into the State's agricultural potential by intervening in agriculture for efficient allocation of resources and optimum productivity. The objectives of state intervention in the agricultural sector are to ensure food security, employment generation, wealth creation, poverty reduction, improved standard of living, and economic development of the rural communities.

Unfortunately, despite the tremendous agricultural potential of Niger State and the various interventions to improve the productivity of agriculture as a driver of economic development, the State suffers from some critical development challenges. Niger State sought to use agriculture to achieve its Vision 3:2020, which envisages that by the year 2020 the State should rank among the top three most developed state economies in Nigeria. However, statistics as of 2018 reveals that Niger State is far from attaining its Vision 3:2020. Economically, Niger state has a per capita income of $1,480, while her entire Gross Domestic Product (GDP) stands at $6.002 billion, placing

her at 18th position in the ranking of Nigerian States by GDP (National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2019a).

In addition, Niger State also ranks poorly in Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) compared to other states with lesser potential. Niger State IGR for 2016 stood at N5,881,584,409.47, representing 8.3 percent of the Federation Account Allocation of 2016. This places the State among the 14 states with the poorest IGR of less than 10 percent in Nigeria (NBS, 2017). Despite Niger State ranking as the leading producer of paddy rice, Shea nuts, and locusts bean seeds in Nigeria (NAERLS, FDAE and P&PCD, 2017; Niger State Development Company, 2011), the agricultural sector's contribution to its Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) is insignificant.

Based on the above background, this study seeks to examine the effects of agricultural policies and intervention programmes on agriculture productivity and economic growth of Niger State.

2. Literature Review

The literature shows divided opinions on the effects of agricultural policies and intervention programmes on agricultural productivity in Nigeria. On one divide are scholars that found that agriculture policies and intervention programmes had minimal impact and unsatisfactory effect on agricultural productivity in Nigeria. Contrarily, a handful of scholars on the other divide found that State intervention had a significant impact on agriculture productivity and economic growth in Nigeria.

Olayemi (1995); Olomola (1998); Garba (1998) all examined Nigeria's agricultural intervention programmes and management using different timeframes. However, these three studies all arrived at closely related findings and concluded that agricultural intervention programmes had minimal impact on agricultural productivity in Nigeria.

Adebayo (2004) examined agriculture development programmes in Nigeria and found that most programmes failed. The study revealed that some programmes failed because they lacked in-depth studies and realistic pilot surveys. In addition, there was a lack of public participation in the design, formulation, implementation, and evaluation of the programmes. While implementing ministries and agencies had a poor understanding of the details and specifics of the programmes.

Obayelu and Okoruwa (2005) used secondary sources to examine economic reforms in Nigeria's agricultural sector from the pre-colonial era to the return to democratic rule in 1999. The study used indicators such as GDP, food prices index, prices of agricultural inputs, effect on poverty, and quality of agricultural products to achieve its objective. The study found that policy implementers were not honest. Thus, the study concluded that economic

reforms in Nigeria could only achieve their objectives through the sincere execution of reform programmes.

Eze, Lemchi, Ugochukwu, Eze, Amulonu and Okon (2010) interrogated agricultural financing policies and rural development in Nigeria. The study found that the government's efforts at making sound agriculture policies were not backed up with adequate budgetary allocation and financing. In addition, a high level of corruption affected the implementation of agriculture intervention programmes. The authors, therefore, concluded that government efforts in agricultural financial policies are inefficient and ineffective. This is the reason why the intended objectives were not achieved.

Along a similar line of thought, Ugwu and Kanu (2011) adopted the desk study method to analyse three decades of agricultural intervention programmes in Nigeria. The study found that the various agriculture intervention programmes had an unsatisfactory effect on agricultural productivity. This was due to policy instability, poor coordination of policies, poor implementation and mismanagement of policy instruments, lack of transparency, and a high rate of corruption. These factors caused the poor performance of the various agricultural intervention programmes.

Iwuchukwu and Igbokwe (2012) relied on secondary data to examine agricultural policies and intervention programme. The study found that the problems that hinder agricultural intervention programmes in Nigeria include: non-interaction between stakeholders, weak agricultural policy, role conflict between different programmes and projects, and short duration of agriculture policies and intervention programmes. Others are the inconsistency of state government agriculture policies with the federal government policies, delay/embezzlement/misappropriation and lack of funds to implement agricultural programmes, inadequate extension services, and inadequate monitoring of intervention programmes.

Nwojiuba (2013) examined state-level intervention in the agricultural sector of Nigeria. The study found that agriculture intervention had limited impact and did not address the challenges of Nigeria's agriculture. Thus, the failure of the agricultural policies was due to the policies themselves. The interventions did not address the development need of the large rural population. Furthermore, the interventions did not consider the emerging challenges of population growth, climate change, and the new generation of farmers, especially young educated farmers.

Igudia (2017) used qualitative logical techniques to show the direction of agricultural policies in Nigeria. The study found that agriculture interventions failed due to poor implementation and sometimes complete adornment of such interventions. This resulted in a fall in foreign exchange earnings, a low Gross Domestic Product (GDP) level, and a lack of sectoral

linkages. The study concluded that agricultural policies and programmes from 1960 to 2017 yielded little or no appreciable results.

Notwithstanding, some scholars found that agricultural policies and intervention programmes had a significant impact on Nigeria's agriculture. Literature search returned scanty results that found that agriculture policies and intervention programmes had a positive effect on the agricultural productivity in Nigeria. For instance, Ayoade (1978) assessed the organization of agriculture research technology and its impact on agricultural productivity in Nigeria. The study found that the introduction of improved varieties of seeds and control of pests and diseases led to an increase in cocoa output over the years. Similarly, Wudir (1991) also found that state intervention through quality research and improved technology led to a significant increase in rice and maize production from 1989 to 1991.

Omenesa (1991) also found that improved varieties developed by researchers led to an increase in the annual production of sorghum. In addition, land used for sorghum production increased from 0.5 million hectares in 1959 to over 3 million hectares in 1989, while total production of sorghum increased to over 3 million tonnes. In agreement, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture [IITA], (1992) reported that the production of cassava tubers in Nigeria in 1989 increased to 13.2 million tonnes due to the output of its research activities.

CBN/CeRAM (2007), an impact assessment report of the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund of Nigeria (ACGSF), showed that agricultural finance had a positive impact on farm income. The report revealed that the total average farm income generated by beneficiaries of the intervention was greater than that of non-beneficiaries. The report further showed a positive impact on employment in all the states studied. In addition, the technical impact on beneficiaries was significant, especially in terms of enterprise expansion and land use. Thus, the report concluded that the intervention supported rural development in Nigeria because of its positive impact.

Daneji (2011) examined agricultural development intervention programmes and their challenges in Nigeria. The study found that some of the agriculture intervention programmes had a positive effect on agricultural productivity. The study attributed the growth in the agricultural output in the late 1980s to the policy and agency-based intervention of successive governments. Notwithstanding, the study asserted that a lack of continuity and inconsistency in policy intervention by subsequent governments is the greatest challenge to guaranteed self-sufficiency in food security in Nigeria.

Kenny (2019) examined the role of agricultural sector performance on economic growth in Nigeria. The study used the Vector Error Correction

Model (VECM). The study found that agriculture interventions had a positive and significant effect on agricultural development in Nigeria. However, it will take at least 24 months for the impact of interventions to be significant on production in Nigeria. Thus, the study concluded that government needs to be committed and consistent with agricultural interventions to achieve its objectives.

Similarly, Balogun (2015) examined agriculture as an important source of generating IGR. Arguing from a historical perspective, the author showed that Nigeria's revenue in the 1970s was majorly from the agricultural sector. Historical records further revealed that the four regions that made up Nigeria exported various agricultural products to generate IGR. The Northern region of Nigeria generated IGR from groundnut, cotton, hides, and skin; the Eastern region relied on palm produce and coal; the Western region was cocoa while the Mid-western region was rubber and timber. These regions used the IGR they generated to develop their respective regions while the remaining balance from the IGR was remitted to the federal government. The study, therefore, noted that the current unfortunate situation in Nigeria, where most states cannot perform basic functions because of extreme dependence on statutory allocations, is due to the neglect of agriculture.

Buttressing the importance of the agricultural sector's potential for generating IGR, Jimoh (2012) drew evidence from the international experience of advanced economies. The author showed that advanced economies such as France, Germany, Italy, China, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, Brazil, and Canada, all improved their revenue generation from cash crops. In these countries, specific states have the responsibility for the production of specific agricultural commodities through which government generates revenue to finance state development. The author, however, noted that on the contrary, similar practice in Nigeria during the First Republic was abandoned along the line, with states now relying on income from the oil sector as their major source of revenue, which is disbursed monthly from the federation account.

From the foregoing, it is evident that empirical review of previous literature revealed a divided opinion on the subject matter. Thus, it is necessary to examine agricultural policies and intervention programmes in Niger State, Nigeria, to understand their effect on agriculture productivity and economic growth.

3. Theoretical Framework and Methodology

3.1 Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the Developmental State Theory to guide the assessment of agricultural policies and intervention programmes in Niger

State. The Developmental State Theory is a macroeconomic planning model where the state, also called a Hard State, drives the planning and industrialization process. This state-led planning and industrialization model exist in East Asia since the late twentieth century. In this model of capitalism, also conceived as State Development Capitalism, the state is independent or autonomous and has political power with control over the economy. The central doctrine of the Developmental State Theory is the notion of state intervention to address structural inadequacies in the economic system as proposed by Keynes (1936). The structuralist Keynesian Welfare State has a central theme, which believes that market failure is a pervasive attribute of the underdeveloped economy, with the effect that the state plays a role in correcting it. Specifically, what is meant by a Developmental State or Hard State is a government with sufficient organization and power to achieve its developmental goals (Chang, 1999). The scholars that developed this theory include Johnson (1982; 1999); Onis (1991); Leftwich (1995); Amsden (1989); Evans (1995); Jessop (2005) and Kim (2008).

The relevance of the developmental state theory to this study is in the sense that the Nigerian Government has from the early 1970s sort to play a role in the mechanization and development of the agricultural sector in Nigeria. The Government intervened in agriculture through grants of subsidized fertilizers, farm inputs, finance, research, and infrastructures, among others. This was done to correct the failure of the market mechanism to allocate resources effectively in a way that will lead to the development of agriculture and enable it to contribute to food security and national development. The failure of the agricultural sector has had consequences on the country's drive to national development in the form of increased food importation, a high level of unemployment, increased poverty incidence, and a drain of foreign exchange (FMARD, 1985). Thus, the Nigeria Government at both federal (national) and state (subnational) levels took on developmental functions from the early 1970s to revive agriculture.

The Developmental State Theory helps explain the Nigerian Government's intervention in agriculture through grants of subsidized fertilizers, farm inputs, finance, research, and infrastructures, among others. Accordingly, the theory is relevant to the assessment of agricultural policies and intervention programmes in Niger State, Nigeria.

3.2 Methodology

This study is secondary research that uses existing data to achieve its objective. The study collected data from secondary sources, which included data on social indicators of the contribution of agriculture to Niger State

economy and also economic growth and development in the state, such as GDP, Federal statutory allocation, Niger State budget, IGR, per capita income, among others. It also collected data on various state government strategies, policies, and programmes on agricultural development. The sources of secondary data also included, but were not limited to the publication from the following Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs): Niger State and Federal Government Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Niger State Planning Commission, Niger State House of Assembly, Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). Others include Niger State and Federal Government Ministry of Finance, National Bureau of Statistics, Niger State Bureau of Statistics, and intense library search from books, journals, articles, newspapers, online sources, and unpublished thesis, among others. The study adopted a purposive sampling technique to select agricultural intervention programmes from 1999 to 2019.

4. Results and Discussion

Appendix 1 indicated that fifteen agricultural policies and intervention programmes were pursued in Niger state between 1999 and 2018 (Niger State Government, 2018). Data from the Appendix showed that Niger State Government solely sponsored only four out of the fifteen intervention programmes. While the other programmes were co-financed by the Federal Government of Nigeria and other Development Partners. This means that stakeholders responsible for agricultural development in Niger State agree that the best approach for promoting agricultural productivity is through a well-designed agricultural policy and intervention programme. However, having a well-designed agricultural policy and intervention programme is different from these interventions having positive effects on agricultural productivity.

Appendix 2 revealed that from 2013 to 2018, all major crops yielded positively except cotton, which data was not available at the time of review (Niger State Government, 2018). However, according to the source document, there was a decrease in 2015 across all crops due to early cessation of rainfall and inadequate supply of farm inputs. The source document further revealed that the factors traceable to the increase in mean farm yield of major crops in Niger State were due to adequate fertilizers/farm inputs provided by the government and support to farmers through development partner funded intervention programmes.

Table 1: Mean Farm Yield of Major Livestock (Million)

Livestock	2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual
Number of Cattle produced	2,289,634	2,358,325	2,429,075	2,501,947	2,577,006
Number of Goat produced	2,659,676	2,739,466	2,821,649	2,906,298	2,993,486
Number of Sheep produced	2,428,400	2,501,252	2,576,290	2,653,579	2,733,186
Number of Poultry produced	7,225,789	7,442,564	7,665,841	7,895,816	8,132,690
Number of Fish produced (metric tonnes)	71.83	72.00	113.5	44.5	39.6
Number of animals inseminate [AI.]	340	336	na	Na	na

Source: Niger State Government (2018)

Table 1 shows a positive increase in the production of livestock year after year since 2013. From 2013 to 2017, there was an increase in livestock production (Niger State Government, 2018). The source document revealed that fish production (metric tonnes) also increased from 2013 to 2015 but decreased in 2016 and 2017 due to low catch because of floods and low rainfall. Animal inseminated was 340 in 2013 and 336 in 2014 as there were no data in the preceding years 2015, 2016, and 2017 due to funding challenges. The source document further revealed that the factors traceable to the increase in livestock in Niger State were due to support from the government and development partner funded intervention programmes.

Table 2: Approve Estimate and Actual Collections of the MDAs in the Agricultural Sector of Niger State, 2016-2018

Agency	Approve Estimate for 2016 (N)	Actual Collections for 2016 (N)	Approved Estimate for 2017 (N)	Actual Collections for 2017 (N)	Approved Estimate for 2018 (N)	Actual Collections for 2018 (N)
*MARD	18,662,000.00	3,373,600.00	49,234,000.00	3,033,800.00	43,884,000.00	16,224,666.45
*MEF	1,500,000	2,723,600	1,500,000.	3,729,000	2,500,000.	3,679,100.

	.00	.00	00	.00	00	00
*MLF	1,710,000.00	-	1,710,000.00	130,750.00	1,710,000.00	130,750.00
*NAMDA	2,000,000.00	720,000.00	2,000,000.00	-	2,000,000.00	-
Total	23,872,000.00	6,817,200.00	54,444,000.00	6,893,550.00	50,094,000.00	20,034,516.45

Source: Extracted from Niger State Internal Revenue MDAs Collections Analysis (2016-2019)
*Note: MARD (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development);
MEF (Ministry of Environment and Forestry)
MLF (Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries)
NAMDA (Niger State Agricultural and Mechanization Development Authority)

Table 2 shows that the agricultural sector contributes to Niger State Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) through the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MLF), and Niger State Agricultural and Mechanization Development Authority (NAMDA). The Table further shows that the actual collections from the MDAs were consistently lower than the approved estimate. For instance, the total approved estimate for the MDAs for 2016 was N23,872,000.00 but the actual collection was N6,817,200.00, representing a collection rate of about 28.56 percent. In 2017, the approved estimate was N54,444,000.00 but the actual collation was N6,893,550.00, representing a collection rate of about 12.66 percent. While the approved estimate for 2018 was N50,094,000.00 but the actual collection was N20,034,516.45, representing a collection rate of about 39.99 percent. The implication is that Niger State Government is not generating optimum revenue from the agricultural sector. This notwithstanding, other economic growth indicators were impressive.

Table 3: Contribution of Agriculture to Niger State GDP and IGR

Year	GDP %	IGR % of the Federation Account Allocation	Amount Generated as IGR (N)
2013	44.5	n.a	4,115,777,679.30
2014	45.0	n.a	5,737,185,035.88
2015	46.1	n.a	5,975,149,921.86
2016	46.5	8.2	5,881,584,409.47
2017	47.2	15.3	6,517,939,033.07
2018	n.a	18.1	10,432,190,956.63
2019	n.a	22.6	12,765,034,972.30
2020	n.a	19.3	10,524,281,921.17

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2016, 2017, 2019a, 2019, 2020 and 2021

Table 3 shows that the contribution of agriculture to Niger State Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increased consistently over five years period, from 44.5 percent in 2013 to 45.0 percent in 2014. It further increased to 46.1 percent in 2015, 46.5 percent in 2016, and 47.2 percent in 2017 (NBS, 2019a). The Table further shows that Niger State IGR also improved considerably over four years period, from 8.2 percent of the Federation Account Allocation (FAA) in 2016 to 15.3 percent of FAA in 2017 and reached 18.1 percent of the FAA in 2018. It further increased to 22.6 percent of the FAA in 2019 but reduced to 19.3 percent of the FAA in 2020. These IGR increases in money figures mean it increased from N5,881,584,409.47 in 2016 to N6,517,939,033.07 in 2017 and reached N10,432,190,956.63 in 2018. It further increased to N12,765,034,972.30 in 2019 but reduced to N10,524,281,921.17 in 2020 (NBS, 2016, 2017, 2019, 2020 and 2021). It is noted that despite the increased productivity of the agricultural sector due to the various intervention programmes, the contribution of the sector to the state IGR remained insignificant due to the low remittance of the agricultural sector's MDAs to the state Board of Internal Revenue. As was shown in Table 2, the actual collections from the MDAs in the agricultural sector were consistently lower than the approved estimate.

4.1 Findings and Implications

First, findings indicate that fifteen agriculture interventions were pursued in Niger State since the return to democratic rule in 1999 up to 2018. These agricultural interventions were financed by either Niger State Government or co-financed with the Federal Government and Development Partners. The implication is that stakeholders responsible for agricultural development in Niger State agree that the best approach for promoting agriculture productivity in the State is through a well-designed agricultural policy and intervention programme. This finding agrees with Iwuchukwu and Igbokwe (2012).

Secondly, agricultural policies and intervention programmes led to an increase in agricultural productivity in Niger State. Consequent to state intervention and support from development partners, there was an increased mean farm yield of metric tonnes of production in maize, rice, sorghum, cassava, yam, groundnut, and other major crops. The study further found increased livestock production of quality animals, especially cattle, goats, and sheep. In addition, there was an increase in poultry production. This finding confirms the research findings of Daneji (2011). Adequate and timely support to farmers is a major contributing factor to agricultural productivity.

Thirdly, the positive effects of agricultural interventions on agricultural productivity affected the overall economic growth of Niger State.

Findings indicate that the Niger State agriculture sector contributes to the State IGR (internally generated revenue) through the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MLF), and Niger State Agricultural and Mechanization Development Authority (NAMDA). However, actual collections from these MDAs were consistently lower than the approved estimate. For instance, in 2016 the collection rate was about 28.56 percent of the approved estimate. In 2017, the actual collection rate dropped to 12.66 percent of the approved estimate. But in 2018, the collection rate rose to about 39.99 percent of the approved estimate. The implication is that the contribution of agriculture to the state IGR will remain insignificant if the low remittance from the MDAs in the sector is not addressed.

Finally, Niger State IGR improved considerably over four years period, from 8.2 percent of the Federation Account Allocation (FAA) in 2016 to 15.3 percent of FAA in 2017, and reached 18.1 percent of the FAA in 2018. It further increased to 22.6 percent in 2019 but reduced to 19.3 percent in 2020; perhaps due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the economy. Furthermore, the finding showed that the contribution of agriculture to Niger State Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increased consistently over five years period, from 44.5 percent in 2013, to 45.0 percent in 2014. It further increased to 46.1 percent in 2015, 46.5 percent in 2016, and reached 47.2 percent in 2017. These findings are consistent with Jimoh (2012) and Balogun (2015). The implication is that these findings support Niger State Government intervention in agriculture to realize its aim of transforming the state into one of Nigeria's top three most developed state economies, based on the State's Vision 3:2020. To this end, the State should approach agricultural development from the Developmental State perspective. Consequently, the State Government will have to mobilize resources to plan and carefully implement agriculture policies and intervention programmes.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study examined the effects of agricultural policies and intervention programmes on agriculture productivity and economic growth of Niger State. It is concluded based on the findings that state intervention and support from development partners had a positive effect on agricultural productivity and economic growth of Niger State. State intervention is essential to address the structural inadequacies in agriculture. Thus, the government has an important role to play in the transformation of agriculture as a driver of economic growth and development. Consequently, the state will have to mobilize

resources to plan and carefully implement agricultural policies and intervention programmes. To this end, the State Government should take advantage of researchers in the tertiary institutions in the State, such as Agriculture Department of the Federal University of Technology, Minna; National Cereal Research Institute, Badeggi; Niger State College of Agriculture, Mokwa; and the National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research, New Bussa.

Niger State Government should conceive a well-designed agricultural policy and intervention programme that will address the shortfall in national food supply and meet the raw material requirements of local industries in Nigeria such as flour mills, breweries, pharmaceuticals, and confectioneries, among others. The recent report on food insecurity in Nigeria by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reveals that the food crisis will affect about 19.4 million Nigerians in 21 states and the FCT, including 416,000 Internally Displaced Persons [IDP] (Udegbunam, 2022), is a window of opportunity for Niger State Government to ramp up its agriculture to address this challenge. In addition, Niger State Government should seek development partners' support and partner with other state governments to ramp up Niger State agriculture to address the shortfall in the national food supply.

Finally, since actual collections from the MDAs in the agricultural sector were consistently lower than the approved estimate, Niger State Government should vigorously pursue automation of its revenue collection system in the MDAs. Niger State Government should also outsource the revenue collection from the MDAs in the agricultural sector to consultants, just as it does for other sectors. The current practice of posting Revenue Officers to MDAs in the agriculture sector might not yield optimum results.

References

Adebayo, K. (2004). Rural development Nigerian: Episodic drama, soap opera and comedy. University of Agriculture Aberkuta Alumin Association Lecture Series No. 6 January 2004.

Amsden, A. (1989). Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialisation. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aribisala, T. S. B. (1983). Nigeria's green revolution: Achievements, problems and prospects', Distinguished Lecture Series No. 1, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER), Ibadan, Nigeria.

Ayoade, A. (1978). Returns to investment in cocoa research in Nigeria. PhD dissertation, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Ibadan.

Balogun, A. (2015). Developing internally generated revenue in an era of diversification. Retrieved from http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/04/.

Central Bank of Nigeria/CeRAM (2007). Agricultural credit guarantee scheme fund of Nigeria (ACGSF): An Impact Assessment. Study conducted by Centre for Resource Analysis and Management (CeRAM) for the Governing Board of the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund, Central Bank of Nigeria, February, 2007.

Chang, H. (1999). *The economic theory of the developmental state.* In M. Woo-Cumings, ed. The Developmental State, New York: Cornell University Press, pp.182-199.

Daneji, M. (2011). Agricultural development intervention programs in Nigeria (1960 to date): A review. *Savannah Journal of Agriculture, 6*(1), 1-7.

Evans, P. (1995). Embedded autonomy: states and industrial transformation. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Eze C., Lemchi J., Ugochukwu A. I., Eze V., Awulonu C., & Okon, A. (2010). Agricultural financing policies and rural development in Nigeria. Paper presented at the 84th Annual Conference, March 29-31, 2010, Edinburgh, Scotland.

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (1985). Information bulletin on Nigeria Agriculture, Abuja, Nigeria.

Garba, P. K. (1998). An analysis of the implementation and stability of Nigerian agricultural policies, 1970 – 1993 Final report submitted to the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi, Kenya.

Hansen, R. G. (1987). A Theory for the Choice of Exchange Medium in Mergers and Acquisitions. *The Journal of Business, 60*(1), 75-95.

Igudia, P. O. (2017). A qualitative analysis of the agricultural policy dynamics and the Nigerian economy: 1960-2015. *European Scientific Journal, 13*(34), 284-312

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (1992) IITA in the News, Ibadan, Jan-June edition pp. 11.

Iwuchukwu, J. C., & Igbokwe, E. M. (2012). Lessons from agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization, 5,* 11-21

Jessop, R. D. (2005). Beyond developmental states. In R. Boyd, & T-W. Ngo Eds.), *Asian states: beyond the developmental perspective* (pp. 19-42). Routledge.

Jimoh, A. (2012). Still on agricultural potentials from oil revenue. Retrieved from https://abujimoh.wordpress.com/2012/03/10/still-on-agricultural-potentials-from-oil-revenue-2/ on 10 May 2022.

Johnson, C. (1982). MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925 – 1975. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, C. (1999).The developmental state: The odyssey of a concept, in Meredith Woo-Cummings, ed. *The Developmental State* (Cornell University Press).

Kenny, S. V. (2019). The role of agricultural sector performance on economic growth in Nigeria. Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/93132/ MPRA Paper No. 93132, posted 09 Apr 2019 16:19 UTC.

Keynes, J. M. (1936). The general theory of employment, interest and money. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Kim, S. Y. (2008). The East Asian Developmental state and its economic and social policies: The case of Korea. *International review of Public Administration*, *12*(2) 69-87.

Leftwich, A. (1995). Bringing politics back in: Towards a model of the developmental state. *Journal of Development Studies*, *31*(3), 400-427.

Mkandawire, T., & Bourenane, N., eds. (1987). *The state and agriculture in Africa.* CODESRIA, Dakar, Senegal. ISBN 9781870784016

NAERLS, FDAE and P&PCD (2017). Agricultural performance survey report of 2017 wet season in Nigeria, NAERLS Press: Zaria ISBN: 2408-7459

National Bureau of Statistics (2016). Internally generated revenue at state level. Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

National Bureau of Statistics (2017). Internally generated revenue at state level. Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

National Bureau of Statistics. (2019a). States nominal gross domestic product (2013-2017) – Phase II. Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

National Bureau of Statistics (2019b). Internally generated revenue at state level (Q4 & full year2018). Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

National Bureau of Statistics (2020). Internally generated revenue at state level (Q4 2019 & full year 2019). Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

National Bureau of Statistics (2021). Internally generated revenue at state level (Q4 & full year 2020). Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary

Niger State Development Company (2011). Niger State Investor Roadmap. Niger State Government.

Niger State Government (2018). Agricultural sector baseline performance review report 2013-2017. Niger State Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Nwojiuba, C. (2013). Nigeria's Agriculture and Food Security Challenges. Retrieved from https://ng.boell.org/sites/default/files/uploads/2013/10/agriculture_-_green_deal_nigeria_study.pdf

Onis, Z. (1991). The logic of the developmental state. Comparative Politics, 24 (1), 109–26.

Organization of African Unity (1981). Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa 1980-2000.

Obayelu, A. E., & Okoruwa, V. O. (2005). Economic reform in the Agricultural sector of Nigeria: Merits and Demerits, Development and Comp Systems 0509014, University library of Munich, Germany.

Olayemi, J. K. (1995). Agricultural Policies for Sustainable Development: Nigeria's Experience in Ikpi A. E. and J. K. Olayemi (Ed). Sustainable Agriculture and Economic Development in Nigeria. Winrock International, 1995.

Olomola, A. S. (1998). Analysis and management of agricultural sector performance and inter-sectional linkages. Paper Presented at Training Programme on Sectoral Policy analysis and Management (NCEMA) June, 1998.

Omenesa, Z. E. (1991). The effect of radio on agricultural development in the Northern States of Nigeria in Lawani S.M. and T. Babalaye (eds). Proceedings of the Workshop on Recent Development in Cereal Production in Nigeria. pp. 63-71.

Udegbunam, O. (2022, March 11). 19.4 million Nigerians to face food insecurity byAugust 2022 - FAO. *Premium Times*. Retrieve from https://www.premiumtimesng.com/

Ugwu, D. S. & Kanu, I. O. (2011). Effects of agricultural reforms on the agricultural sector in Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies and Development, 4*(2), 51-59.

Wudir, B. B. (1991). Cereals in the Food Economy of Nigeria in Lawani S.M. and T. Babaleye (eds). Proceedings of the Workshop on Recent Development in Cereal Production in Nigeria. Ibadan IITA 2-4 Sept. 1991 pp. 13-25.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Agricultural Intervention Policies and Programmes in Niger State

S/N	Policy/Programme	Year of Operation	Sponsor(s)	Objective(s)
1	National Programme on Food Security (NPFS)	2001-2006	Federal Government of Nigeria and NEPAD	Rapid and sustainable increase and stability in food production
2	Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)	2001-2010	IFAD, Federal Government of Nigeria, and State Governments	Sustainable roots and tubers production; support to processing and marketing; and programme management and evaluation
3	National Fadama Development Project III+AF (Additional Financing)	2014-2019	World Bank, Federal, State, and Local Governments	Support farmers that grow rice, sorghum, cassava, and horticulture crops
4	West Africa Agricultural Productivity Programme (WAAPP)	2009-2019	World Bank	Generate and disseminate improved agricultural technologies
5	Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme (CACS)	2009-2025	Federal Government of Nigeria	To finance Nigeria's agricultural value chain in production, processing, storage, and marketing
6	Rice Post Harvest Processing and Marketing Pilot Project (RIPMAPP)	2011-2015	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Conduct training and provide technical guidance to Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) personnel, and the people involved in rice production and processing
7	Niger State Vision 3:2020	2011-2020	Niger State Government	Agricultural-based industrialization of Niger State
8	International Fund for Agriculture Development-Value Chain Development Programme (IFAD-VCDP)	2015-2020	IFAD	To increase the profit and food security of poor rural households that produced, processed, and market rice and cassava
9	Anchor Borrower's Programme (ABP)	2015-ongoing	Federal Government of Nigeria	To improve farm production, stabilize inputs supply to agro-

				processors and reverse Nigeria's negative balance of payments on food.
10	Agricultural Transformation Agenda Support Programme – Phase 1 (ATASP – 1)	2015-2019	African Development Bank (AfDB) and Federal Government of Nigeria	To ensure food and nutrition security and contribute to employment generation and wealth creation
11	Competitive African Rice Initiative (CARI)	2013-2021	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	To improve the livelihoods of rice farmers, 30 percent of whom should be female, and to increase the competitiveness of the domestic rice supply
12	Niger State Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP)	2013-2015	Niger State Government	Provided a roadmap for drafting a Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS), by the various sectors of the economy and other interest groups.
13	Niger State Agricultural Sector Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS)	2016-2018	Niger State Government	To ensure food security, employment generation, wealth creation, and economic development of the rural communities
14	The Second Rural Access and Mobility Project (RAMP-2)	2014-2018	World Bank and French Development Agency	To rehabilitate 500 km of rural roads across the three geo-political zones of Niger State
15	Niger State Agriculture Reform Agenda	2015-2019 and 2019-2023	Niger State Government	To achieve self-sufficiency in food production and employment generation.

Source: Authors compilation sourced from Niger State Government (2018) and Online Sources

Appendix 2: Mean Farm Yield of Major Crops in Niger State ('000 MT)

Crop	2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2018 Actual
Rice	824.486	1,573.119	2154.335	2,725.234	3,447.421	4,360.987
Maize	374.772	693.703	410.127	518.810	656.295	830.213
Sorghum	351.452	670.570	597.563	755.917	956.235	1,209.637
Millet	255.695	487.866	484.145	612.443	774.741	980.047
Cassava	9,203.47	17,560.221	17,005.353	21,511.772	27,212.391	34,423.68
Yam	3,610.186	6,888.235	10,574.801	13,377.123	16,922.061	21,406.407
Sweet Potato	n.a	2,434.158	3,163.631	4,001.994	5,062.523	6,404.092
Ground Nut	499.531	953.105	1,463.201	1,850.950	2,341.451	2961.936
Cow Pea	129.976	247.994	380.719	481.610	609.237	770.685
Cotton	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a
Sugar Cane	655.659	1250.997	1920.494	2429.425	3,073.223	3,887.627
Soya Bean	36.146	68.967	1,058.793	1,339.373	1,694.307	2,143.299
Tomatoes	129.862	247.777	380.398	481.204	608.723	770.035
Melon	n.a.	839.632	1,190.544	1,506.039	1,905.139	2,410.001
Benniseed/ Sesame	12.986	24.777	38.038	48.119	60.870	77.001
Pepper	n.a.	229.868	442.631	559.929	708.310	896.012
Okra	n.a.	340.569	1,019.044	1,289.090	1,630.699	2,062.835

Source: Niger State Government (2018) and Niger State Agricultural and Mechanization Development Authority (NAMDA) Production Figures 2014-2018