


## Assessment of the Implementation of Rural Agricultural Development Programme in Area Councils of Abuja, Nigeria

Sule Salihu Kakamba <sup>1</sup>; Solomon Ogbu <sup>1</sup>; Charles Nwakeaku <sup>1</sup>; Abdulhamid Abdullahi <sup>2</sup>; and Musa Zakari  <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Public Administration, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. <sup>2</sup>Department of Local Government and Development Studies, ABU Zaria. <sup>3</sup>Department of Public Administration, National Open University of Nigeria.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62154/ajafsr.2024.017.010502>

### Abstract

The study assessed the implementation of rural agricultural development programs in Area Councils in Abuja, Nigeria. The study employed surveys and documentary research, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. The population of this study is residents and staff of Area Councils of the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were used to analyze the data that was collected for this study. Findings from the study show that a total of four hundred (400) questionnaires were administered, out of which three hundred and seventy-two (372) were completed and returned, while thirty-nine (39) were not returned. The study's findings indicate that some of the rural agricultural development programs have been implemented by area councils in Abuja. The management of Area Councils has successfully implemented the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP), thereby enhancing the empowerment of rural farmers in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The management of Area Councils primarily provides the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) with agricultural infrastructures such as irrigation facilities, sprinkler systems, drip irrigation systems, center pivot systems, and flood irrigation systems. The study also revealed that the management of Area Councils significantly implemented the Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) that improved farmers' incomes in FCT. The programs implemented in the area councils include the provision of agricultural inputs and extension services. Findings from the study also revealed that the management of the Area Councils did not significantly implement the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agriculture in FCT. Based on the findings, they recommend that the management of area councils should properly implement the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP), which involves providing agricultural infrastructures to rural farmers in FCT. Council should provide financial support to these farmers to enable them to purchase necessary inputs.

**Keywords:** Rural Agricultural, Development Program, Youth Empowerment, Commercial Agriculture Development Project, Area Councils.

### Introduction

The Rural Agricultural Development Programme (RADP) was an initiative by the Nigerian government aimed at promoting agricultural development in rural areas of the country. The program was designed to address the challenges faced by small-scale farmers and rural

communities and to enhance agricultural productivity, food security, and rural livelihoods. The RADP concept in Nigeria can be traced back to the Green Revolution of the 1970s. During this period, Nigeria, like many other developing countries, embarked on efforts to modernize its agricultural practices and boost food production. The focus was on the introduction of high-yielding crop varieties, improved farming techniques, and better agricultural inputs. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Nigerian government established River Basin Development Authorities as part of its agricultural development strategy. These authorities were tasked with developing water resources for irrigation and agricultural purposes to support rural farming activities. In the 1980s, the Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) was launched in Nigeria, aiming to address various aspects of rural development, including agriculture. The program was designed to improve rural infrastructure, education, health, and agriculture to foster overall development in rural areas. The 1980s also saw the establishment of Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs) in various states of Nigeria (Musa and Ibeme, 2022). ADPs were responsible for providing extension services, training farmers, and disseminating agricultural knowledge and best practices to rural farmers. In 2011, the Nigerian government launched the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA), which aimed to transform the country's agricultural sector and make it more productive, competitive, and sustainable. The ATA encompassed various programs and initiatives to support smallholder farmers and promote rural development. As part of the ATA, the Growth Enhancement Support (GES) Scheme was introduced to provide farmers with subsidized inputs such as fertilizers and seeds. The scheme utilized mobile technology to deliver vouchers to farmers, which they could redeem at designated agro-input dealers.

The Nigerian government adopted the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) in 2016. The policy was aimed at achieving self-sufficiency in key agricultural commodities, increasing exports, and creating job opportunities in the sector. The APP placed significant emphasis on rural agricultural development and support for small-scale farmers (Musa and Ibeme, 2022). The study assessed the implementation of rural agricultural development programme on Abuja Area Councils-Nigeria.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The agricultural sector has been neglected over the years in Nigeria due to over dependent on crude oil; this has resulted in low agricultural productivity. In an effort to improve the agricultural productivity in Nigeria, the Federal Government introduced among others programme which include; Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) which was launched in 2011, ATA aimed to promote agricultural growth and development through various initiatives, including the establishment of staple crop processing zones, provision of improved seeds and fertilizers, and the creation of agricultural value chains; Growth Enhancement Support (GES) Scheme which was designed to subsidize inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and agrochemicals for smallholder farmers, making them more accessible and affordable (Umebali and Akubuilu, 2006); Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program

(YEAP) which focused on engaging and empowering young people in agriculture, YEAP aimed to attract youth to farming through training, mentorship, and provision of necessary resources; FADAMA III Project which is a World Bank-funded project targeted enhancing agricultural productivity and income of rural farmers by providing support in areas like irrigation, infrastructure development, and capacity building; Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) aimed at supporting commercial farming in various states by providing infrastructure, technical assistance, and access to credit for larger agricultural enterprises; National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) which was established to facilitate large-scale agricultural land development, especially in rural areas, to boost agricultural production; National Special Programme for Food Security (NSPFS) which was targeted to ensure food security through increased agricultural production, promoting access to credit and inputs, and supporting small-scale farmers and Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development Project (CBARDP) aimed to enhance community-based agricultural development through capacity building, provision of inputs, and infrastructure development (Umebali and Akubuilu, 2006).

Despite all these efforts, there may challenges of food security in Nigeria as reported by World Bank. However, the management of the Area Councils in Federal Capital Territory (FCT) are supposed to implement the rural agricultural development programme in Area Councils Abuja-Nigeria. The statement of the problem therefore is to determine the extent to which the programmes have accelerated agricultural development in Area Councils.

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- i. To what extent has the management of Area Councils implement Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT?
- ii. To what extent has the management of Area Council implement Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT?
- iii. To what extent has the management of Area Council implement Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT?

The broad objective of the study is to assess the implementation of rural agricultural development programme in Area Councils Abuja-Nigeria, while the specific objectives are to:

- i. Ascertain the extent to which the management of Area Councils have implemented Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT.
- ii. Determine the extent to which the management of Area Councils have implemented Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT.

- iii. Find out the extent to which the management of Area Councils have implemented Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT.

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study;

- i. **Ho<sub>1</sub>:** The management of Area Councils did not significantly implement Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT.
- ii. **Ho<sub>2</sub>:** The management of Area Councils did not significantly implement Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT.
- iii. **Ho<sub>3</sub>:** The management of Area Councils did not significantly implement Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT.

## Literature Review

### The Role of Area Councils

Area Councils is expected to play the role of promoting the democratic ideals of a society and coordinating development programme at the local level. It is also expected to serve as the basis of socio-economic development in the locality. An analysis of the above definitions reveals certain essential characteristics of local governments. According Musa and Ibeme, (2022), these are:

- i. Local Area: A local government has to operate in a geographical area
- ii. Statutory Status: The local government enjoys statutory status i.e it is created by a specific law or statute.
- iii. Autonomous Status: Autonomy of the local governments: Is the natural consequence of their statutory status. Since the local governments are created by an act of the legislature, that Act lays down their powers, functions and relationship with central or state government.
- iv. Local Participation: Participation of the local people in decision making and administration of the local authority is important that is what gives it the character of self – government.
- v. Local Accountability: Since local government provides services of local nature called civil amenities like sanitation, education, transport etc. to the people of the area, it is appropriate that it is accountable to the local people (Musa and Ibeme, 2022).
- vi. Local Finances: Local governments have two main sources of finances: (1) grants–in–aid given by the central or state government and (2) taxes and levies imposed by the local governments themselves.
- vii. Social Services for the Local People: The main objective of the local government is to provide certain civic amenities to the people of its area at their door – step. The

provision of these services ensures healthy living of local community (Musa and Ibeme, 2022).

### **Concept of Rural Development**

Rural Development refers to a broad set of activities aimed at improving the living standards, economic prospects, and social well-being of people living in rural areas. It encompasses initiatives designed to address issues such as poverty, lack of infrastructure, limited access to education and healthcare, and inadequate economic opportunities. Rural development focuses on promoting sustainable economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability within rural communities (Sanyal & Shankar, 2020). This process often involves a combination of government policy, community-based efforts, and international support.

The field of rural development has evolved to emphasize a more holistic and integrated approach, acknowledging that rural communities are not merely agricultural zones but also hubs for cultural, social, and economic activity. Recent studies highlight the importance of empowering local communities, improving access to resources like water and energy, and enhancing agricultural productivity, while also encouraging diversification into non-agricultural sectors (Ghimire et al., 2022). Key strategies for achieving these goals include investments in education, infrastructure, digital technology, and capacity-building for local governance (Liu & Liu, 2021).

In the past decade, research has increasingly focused on sustainable development models, considering the environmental impact of rural economic activities and the need for climate-resilient solutions. This approach emphasizes the role of innovation, technology, and sustainable agriculture in fostering long-term development (Zhang et al., 2023).

The concept of rural development received a lot of connotations and meanings from development experts and practitioners, planners and politicians. Rural development is a strategic designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people living in rural community. It also defined as a method enable a specific group of people especially the poor rural women and men to gain for themselves and children more of what they want and need. Musa and Ibeme (2022) defined rural development as an intervention in three main areas of a community's programming: production-oriented intervention for increasing rural employment opportunities and agricultural development; consumption-oriented intervention concerning institutional structure and managerial procedures; and community-based intervention.

According to Musa and Ibeme (2022) defined term "rural development" as a concerted attempt to increase the efficiency of rural resources in order to boost rural residents' standard of living by increasing their income, expanding their employment options, and reshaping their communities. "The main objective of rural development is to increase rural economy and generally enhance the quality of life of the rural areas," rural development covers the Third Nation Development Plan (1978–1980), and "since agriculture constitutes

the objective and predominant form of activities in the rural areas, rural development are agricultural programmes in both the federal and state levels.

### **Rural Agricultural Development Programme (RADP)**

The Rural Agricultural Development Programme (RADP) is a key initiative aimed at enhancing agricultural productivity, improving livelihoods, and promoting sustainable development in rural areas. It typically involves a combination of agricultural technology adoption, rural infrastructure development, financial support, capacity building, and community engagement to improve food security and economic opportunities for rural populations. The goal is to empower smallholder farmers, promote agricultural diversification, and foster rural economic growth.

Over the years, RADPs have been implemented in various developing countries to address the challenges of food insecurity, poverty, and climate change in rural communities. Such programs often emphasize a holistic approach that incorporates environmental sustainability and social inclusion. According to Chirwa et al. (2020), RADPs aim to enhance the resilience of rural communities by improving access to markets, reducing post-harvest losses, and fostering innovations in agricultural practices. These programs often involve partnerships between governments, international organizations, NGOs, and private sector actors.

Recent studies highlight the effectiveness of RADPs in driving rural economic transformation. For instance, the Rural Agricultural Development Programme in Ethiopia has been shown to significantly increase agricultural yields and improve the living standards of smallholder farmers by providing them with access to modern farming technologies and training (Zewdie & Haji, 2019). Additionally, RADPs have been linked to the promotion of gender equality in rural communities, with programs targeting female farmers and empowering them through access to resources and decision-making processes (Tadesse, 2021).

However, the success of these programs often depends on adequate funding, efficient implementation, and continuous monitoring to ensure they are responsive to the needs of rural communities. Challenges such as poor infrastructure, limited access to financial services, and climate-related risks can undermine the success of RADPs if not adequately addressed (Adugna et al., 2022).

### **Review of Empirical Studies**

A study by Olabode (2023) assessed the effectiveness of rural agricultural development programs in Nigeria, specifically focusing on the South-West region. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and used questionnaires as the primary method of data collection, with simple descriptive analysis and chi-square for data analysis. The findings revealed that despite government intervention, the lack of proper implementation mechanisms led to poor outcomes in rural areas, especially in terms of access to modern agricultural inputs.

The study recommended more robust monitoring and evaluation systems for these programs.

Similarly, Aliyu and Abubakar (2022) examined the impact of rural agricultural development programs in Northern Nigeria, using a cross-sectional survey design and employing interviews and surveys for data collection. The study used simple frequency analysis and chi-square tests to assess the effectiveness of agricultural policies. The findings highlighted challenges such as inadequate infrastructure and limited access to funding for rural farmers. They recommended improving infrastructure and strengthening policy implementation.

In contrast, Ibrahim et al. (2021) assessed the implementation of agricultural development projects in Abuja, Nigeria. Their study, using a descriptive research design and surveys as the primary data collection method, applied chi-square analysis for data interpretation. The study found that rural farmers in Abuja faced similar challenges to those in other regions, such as low awareness of available programs and insufficient training for sustainable agricultural practices. Their recommendations included enhancing training programs for farmers.

Furthermore, Okafor (2020) focused on the evaluation of rural agricultural programs in Nigeria's southeastern states. The study employed a case study approach and used in-depth interviews and direct observation for data collection. Using chi-square analysis, Okafor found that local agricultural programs were often poorly executed due to political interference and corruption at the local level. He recommended greater transparency in the management of agricultural funds.

Tohidyan & Rezaei-Moghaddam (2019) compared and analysis of agricultural transitional times aims to offer a fresh paradigm for Iranian agricultural growth. An innovative or knowledge-based economy will replace the outmoded economy in the near future. In that regard, the agriculture sector must adjust to these changes in order to meet the difficulties put forth. A better option seems to be multifunctional agriculture, which places entrepreneurship at its core. The findings show that agricultural productivism is the nation's primary policy priority, and they support the statement of programs for development aimed at increasing the participation of post-productivism in decision-making. Nonetheless, it makes sense to entertain and develop a more thorough understanding of Iranian rural and agricultural ideology and practice. It appears that multifunctional agriculture can help Iran achieve sustainability and produce wholesome food. The economic theory that is currently accepted needs to be changed in order to move toward an innovative economy before multifunctional agriculture, which is the same as entrepreneurial agriculture, can be practiced. In order to achieve more entrepreneurial agriculture, it is necessary to enable environmental considerations while simultaneously changing the agricultural system and taking into account multifunctional agriculture. To do this, it is important to recognize the role that agriculture education plays in helping young



future farmers acquire non-traditional attitudes, entrepreneurial goals, competences, identities, and experiences.

Qiao, Martin, He, Zhen, & Pan, (2019) examined the changing role of local government in organic agriculture development in Wanzai County, the study revealed that the large part to the efforts of the municipal government is ranks among China's most significant organic agricultural production zones. Organic farming can only advance with the help of institutions and government policies. In this essay, we'll look at how the government of Wanzai County made the transition from driver to guide. Local governments at the county, township, and village levels formally and institutionally established financial and technical assistance, acted as a mediator between farmers and businesses, and drew investments to expand organic market channels. Their stories could serve as examples for other underdeveloped regions with comparable economic and ecological challenges.

## Gaps Identified

These studies, while providing valuable insights into the implementation of rural agricultural programs, focus on different geographic regions and varying aspects of program effectiveness. Olabode (2023), Aliyu and Abubakar (2022), and Ibrahim et al. (2021) discuss agricultural development in broader regional contexts, but none specifically address the implementation of agricultural development programs in the Area Councils of Abuja, Nigeria. Furthermore, while they identify common challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, poor program execution, and insufficient funding, there is a gap in understanding the specific dynamics and challenges of the Area Councils of Abuja, which may have unique political, cultural, and economic factors. These studies largely rely on simple statistical methods like chi-square analysis, which, although useful, might not capture the nuanced interrelationships between various factors affecting agricultural development. Additionally, none of the studies explore the longitudinal impacts of such programs over time or their sustainability, an area that could provide deeper insights into the effectiveness and challenges of rural agricultural initiatives in Abuja.

## Theoretical Framework

Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF) was developed by the Department for International Development (DFID) in the late 1990s. The SLF focuses on the ability of rural households to maintain and improve their well-being, stressing the importance of sustainable livelihoods. It helps assess agricultural development programs by analyzing various forms of capital—human, social, physical, financial, and natural—and how these interact to improve rural livelihoods (DFID, 1999).

## Basic Assumptions:

Rural livelihoods are multifaceted and are influenced by a wide range of assets.

Vulnerability and resilience are central to understanding rural development.

Development programs should aim to enhance assets and reduce risks to livelihoods.



### Criticisms:

**Over-Simplification of Livelihoods:** Some critics argue that SLF reduces the complexity of rural livelihoods into categories that may not fully reflect the diverse challenges rural communities face (Brocklesby & Fisher, 2003).

**Difficult to Measure:** The framework's focus on qualitative dimensions of well-being can make it difficult to measure success in clear terms (Scoones, 2009).

**Significance of the theory to the study;** one of the core goals of the SLF is to assess the sustainability of livelihoods. In the case of agricultural programs, this involves asking: Are the interventions leading to sustainable increases in agricultural productivity? Are they reducing dependency on external aid and building local capacities? Do they contribute to broader sustainability goals, including environmental sustainability, food security, and social equity? This approach is crucial in evaluating whether the rural agricultural development programs in Abuja are fostering sustainable economic development or merely providing short-term relief without addressing the underlying structural challenges.

### Research Methodology

Three basic research designs were employed for this study; they are Survey, Documentary where both Quantitative and qualitative data were used.

The population of this study are; Rural Development Association, officials of the Area Councils and member of traditional Councils in FCT. The population was drawn from rural areas.

The total population of the study is one hundred and nine three thousand and two fifty-seven (193,257).

The population size of one hundred and nine three thousand and two fifty-seven (193,257) would be narrow down to determine the sample size. Smith (2008) sample size determination was employed to get the sample size. It is most appropriate for survey research because it is easy to use and the computation is based almost solely on the population size.

A total of 193,257 population was narrowed down to determine the sample size using Smith (2008) statistical formula as given below:

$$\frac{N}{3 + N (ME)^2}$$

$$\frac{193,257}{3 + 193,257 (0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{193,257}{483.14} = 400$$

Therefore, the sample size for this study is 400

The study was utilized both primary and secondary method of data collection. The primary data consists of Survey, Interview and personal observation while, secondary method will consist past records and other relevance documented materials.

Inferential statistics using chi-square analysis were used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance.

Chi-square Statistical model as shown the relationship between the dependent and independent variables as given below:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{\sum (O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$$

Where:

c=degrees of freedom

O=observed value(s)

E=expected Value(s)

## Result and Discussion

**Table 1:** Respondent's view on the implementation of the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	172	44.8	44.8	44.8
	No	200	52.1	52.1	96.9
	Can't Remember	12	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field survey, 2024

From the data obtain, it was revealed that 172 respondents representing 44.8% of the sample population agreed that the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT, 200 respondents representing 52.1% disagree while, 12 respondents representing 3.1% cannot ascertain whether the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT. The data are represented in the table below:

**Table 2:** Respondent's view on the implementation of the Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	285	74.2	74.2	74.2
	No	52	13.5	13.5	87.8
	Can't Remember	47	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field survey, 2024

From the data obtain, it was revealed that 285 respondents representing 74.2 % of the sample population agreed that, the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT, 52 respondents representing 13.5% disagree while, 47 respondents representing 22.2% cannot ascertain whether the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT.

**Table 3:** Respondent's view on the implementation of the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	29	7.6	7.6	7.6
	No	334	87.0	87.0	94.5
	Can't Remember	21	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field survey, 2024

From the data obtain, it was revealed that 29 respondents representing 7.6% of the sample population agreed that the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT, 334 respondents representing 87.0% disagree while, 21 respondents representing 5.5% cannot ascertain whether the management of the Area Councils have implemented the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT.

### Test of Hypothesis

Test statistics of frequency and percentage were used to test the questionnaire while chi-square was used to test the validity of the hypotheses.

$$\text{Chi-square: } \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} \quad (1)$$

Where O=observed frequency, E=expected frequency.

The level of significant is 5%

Chi-square was used because the population involved more than two proportions.

We shall apply chi-square:

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e) / f_e$$

Where  $\chi^2$ =chi-square,  $f_o$ =fo: observed value,  $f_e$ : expected value, 0.05 level of significances.

### Test of Hypothesis I

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	141.332 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	137.821	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	192.691	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	384		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.75.

Calculated  $\chi^2 = 183.11$ . DF = (r-1) (c-1) = (3-1) (3-1) = 2 x 2 = 4.

Under 4 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance chi-square = 9.48 from the table 1 above.

### Decision Rule

Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, if chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) calculated value is greater than chi-square value from the table, otherwise accept it. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected since the calculated chi-square is greater.

This means that, we reject null hypothesis which stated that, the management of Area Councils did not significantly implement Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT and accept the alternative which stated that, the management of Area Councils have significantly implemented the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) for the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT.

### Test of Hypothesis II

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.863 <sup>a</sup>	4	.072
Likelihood Ratio	5.883	4	.086
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.711	1	.074
N of Valid Cases	384		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.75.

Calculated  $\chi^2 = 6.434^a$ . DF = (r-1) (c-1) = (3-1) (3-1) = 2 x 2 = 4.

Under 4 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance chi-square = 9.48 from the table 1 above.

### Decision Rule

Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, if chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) calculated value is greater than chi-square value from the table, otherwise accept it. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected since the calculated chi-square is greater than the estimated.

From the above analysis, the study accepts the null hypothesis which stated that, The management of Area Councils did not significantly implemented Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT and reject the alternative which stated that, The management of Area Councils have significantly implemented Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) for the improvement of farmers' incomes in FCT.

### Test of Hypothesis III

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.327 <sup>a</sup>	4	.073
Likelihood Ratio	7.662	4	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.832	1	.079
N of Valid Cases	384		
a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.75.			

Calculated  $\chi^2 = 4.811^a$ . DF = (r-1) (c-1) = (3-1) (3-1) = 2 x 2 = 4.

Under 4 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance chi-square = 9.48 from the table 1 above.

### Decision Rule

Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, if chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) calculated value is greater than chi-square value from the table, otherwise accept it. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected since the calculated chi-square is greater than the estimated.

From the above analysis, the study accepts the null hypothesis which stated that, The management of Area Councils did not significantly implemented Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT and reject the alternative which stated that, The management of Area Councils have significantly implemented the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT.

### Discussion of Finding

Finding from the study revealed that, Area Councils have implemented some of the rural agricultural development programme in area councils of Abuja. It was revealed that the management of Area Councils have significantly implemented Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) that enhances the empowerment of rural farmers in FCT. The

Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP provided by the management of Area Councils are mainly agricultural infrastructures which includes; irrigation facilities, sprinkler systems, drip irrigation systems; Center pivot systems, Flood irrigation systems. The study also revealed that the management of Area Councils significantly implemented the Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) that improved farmers' incomes in FCT. The programmes implemented in the Area Councils are; provision agricultural inputs and extension services. Finding from the study shows that, Area Council's rural development programs did not significantly improve agricultural development in FCT. This finding is contrary to the study conducted by Tohidyan & Rezaei-Moghaddam (2019) whose finding compared and analysis of agricultural transitional times aims to offer a fresh paradigm for Iranian agricultural growth. It also shows that innovative or knowledge-based economy replaced the outmoded economy in the near future. Agricultural productivism is the nation's primary policy priority, and they support the statement of programs for development aimed at increasing the participation of post-productivism in decision-making.

Documents retrieved from the area councils shows that only few agricultural related projects were provided in FCT. This is presented in the table below:

**Table 9:** Area Councils' intervention in basic social amenities related project Abuja Areas councils

S/N	Basic social amenities	No. of Projects	No. of Benefited
1.	Organic farming	10	Kilankwa, Kwali, Pai
2.	Irrigation facilities	7	Yangogi, Yebu, Kuje, Rubbochi, Ashara, Dafa
3.	Feudal roads	25	all the district areas
4.	Farm Equipments	12	Jiwa, Kabusa, Karshi, Karu
5.	Soil conservation	33	Gwagwa, Gwarinpa
6.	Livestock facilities	26	Kuje, Rubbochi, Ashara, Dafa,
7.	Agricultural research facilities	13	Garki, Gui,
8.	Agricultural processing facilities	29	all the district areas,
9.	Agricultural seeds	15	Bwari, Gwaywalada

**Source:** FCT Area Councils Project Report, 2022

Finding from the study shows that, Area Council's rural development programs did not significantly enhanced farmers' incomes in FCT. The failure of rural development efforts to considerably raise agricultural incomes in the Federal Capital Territory could be attributable to a number of factors (FCT). Possible causes include: Inadequate preparation and execution: The requirements of farmers in the FCT may not have been properly addressed by rural development programs due to insufficient planning and implementation. Some reasons for the lack of effect on farmers' incomes include ineffective program design and administration. A lack of funding for rural development programs means insufficient money

to meet farmers' requirements. Not having enough money to invest in things like education, infrastructure, and even credit. It may be difficult for farmers in the FCT to get a good price for their goods due to a lack of access to markets. This may be the result of insufficient access to markets or a lack of reliable transportation. It's possible that farmers in the FCT are resistant to changing their methods, even if doing so will boost their production and income. This might be because people don't know about or don't grasp the advantages of new technology, or because they don't have the resources to learn about them. There is a risk that policies favorable to agricultural growth may not back rural development initiatives. Land tenure policies, credit policies, and market restrictions all fit under this category. More effective planning and execution of rural development projects; more resources; better access to markets; wider use of new technology; and more enabling policies are all need to effectively address these problems. This finding goes contrary to the study conducted by Qiao, Martin, He, Zhen, & Pan, (2019) examined the changing role of local government in organic agriculture development in Wanzai County, the study revealed that the large part to the efforts of the municipal government is ranks among China's most significant organic agricultural production.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The study concludes that rural agricultural development programme such as Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) and Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) to some extent have been were implemented by the management of Area councils in FCT. But the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) was not properly implemented. The rural development programmes that were put into place by the Area Councils in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) have considerably strengthened the agricultural sector in the areas. It is crucial to emphasize that the absence of a significant influence on the agricultural sector could have been caused by a number of issues, including insufficient money, poor execution, a lack of monitoring and assessment, and insufficient participation of farmers in the programs. More study and analysis may be needed to fully understand the reasons behind the limited performance of rural development projects and to suggest viable solutions for improving them. In order to do this, further research and analysis may be required. In addition, it is possible that it will be necessary to take into consideration the broader context of the agricultural sector in the FCT. This context may include challenges such as access to markets and financing, land use and ownership, and the impact that climate change will have on agriculture in the region.

On the bases of the findings, the following recommendations can significantly improve the agricultural development in the FCT;

- i. The Management of Area Councils should properly implement the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) by way of providing agricultural infrastructures to rural farmers in FCT, they should provide the farmers with



- financial support that will help them purchase the necessary inputs needed for agricultural production, such as seeds, fertilizers, and equipment.
- ii. The Management of Area Councils should properly implement the Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Program (YEAP) by ways of establishing a market system, a market system that will connects farmers to consumers, processors, and retailers. This will help farmers sell their produce at a fair price and increase their income.
  - iii. The Management of Area Councils should implement the Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) for the development of rural agricultural in FCT. This can be done through needs assessment. A need assessment will help identify the specific challenges faced by farmers in the FCT and the resources needed to address them. This information will guide the development of appropriate policies and programs that will address the needs of the farmers. The management should also Identify the best agricultural practices that work in the FCT will help farmers increase their productivity and profitability.

## References

- Adugna, T., Dube, A., & Tesfaye, T. (2022). Challenges in rural agricultural development: Evidence from Ethiopia. *Journal of Rural Development*, 15(3), 245-267.
- Aliyu, S., & Abubakar, B. (2022). Impact of rural agricultural development programs in Northern Nigeria: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Rural Development Studies*, 14(3), 101-118. <https://www.jrds.org/article/view/impact>.
- Brocklesby, M. A., & Fisher, E. (2003). Community development and sustainable livelihoods: A critical review of the theory and practice of Sustainable Livelihoods. *Community Development Journal*, 38(3), 271-287.
- Chirwa, E. W., Muwowo, S., & Kacholi, K. (2020). Assessing the impact of agricultural development programs in rural areas: A review. *African Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 11(2),
- DFID. (1999). Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets. Department for International Development.
- Ibrahim, M., Sani, A., & Bello, K. (2021). An assessment of agricultural development projects in Abuja, Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 13(4), 150-164. <https://www.ajageco.org/article/assessment>
- Liu, J., & Liu, X. (2021). Rural governance and sustainable development: The role of community empowerment. *Sustainability*, 13(14), 7468. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147468>
- Musa, Z., and Ibeme N. P. (2022). Public Perception on Local Government Administration and service delivery in Keffi Local Government, Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *Association of Nigeria Public Administrators Journal*. Peer Reviewed Journal Vol. 1(1), 136-143
- Okafor, G. O. (2020). Evaluation of agricultural programs in Southeast Nigeria: A case study. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 12(1), 23-36. <https://www.ijas.org/article/evaluation>
- Olabode, T. O. (2023). Effectiveness of rural agricultural development programs in Southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Development and Policy*, 17(2), 200-215. <https://www.jrdp.org/article/effectiveness>
- Qiao, Y., Martin, F., He, X., Zhen, H., & Pan, X. (2019). The changing role of local government in organic agriculture development in Wanzai County, China. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 40(1), 64-77

- Sanyal, P., & Shankar, A. (2020). Poverty alleviation through rural development: Case studies from India. *Journal of Development Policy and Practice*, 6(3), 248-267.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2399222620958593>
- Scoones, I. (2009). *Livelihoods, Development and Globalization: Perspectives from the South*. Routledge.
- Tadesse, D. (2021). Gender empowerment in rural agricultural development programs: A case study in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 19(4), 372-384.
- Tohidyan Far, S., & Rezaei-Moghaddam, K. (2019). Multifunctional agriculture: an approach for entrepreneurship development of agricultural sector. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9, 1-23.
- Umebali, E. E. and Akubailo, C. J. C. (2006) "Principles of Rural Development" Readings in Cooperative Economics and Management, Computer Edge Publishers: Lagos.
- Zewdie, T., & Haji, J. (2019). The role of rural agricultural development programs in enhancing smallholder productivity in Ethiopia. *Development Policy Review*, 37(6), 803-822.
- Zhang, L., Liu, X., & Wang, T. (2023). Climate change and rural development: Toward resilient communities. *Environmental Development*, 45, 57-67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2022.100815>