

**ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN PROVIDING FOOD SECURITY IN NIGERIA:
A STUDY OF KAJURU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE,
2011-2017**

Dr. Yakubu Haruna Ja'e

Department Political Science, Kaduna State University, Kaduna.

GSM: +2348039503991

Email: yaakobjae@gmail.com

&

Mr. Adamu Shawai Nehemiah

Department Political Science, Kaduna State University, Kaduna.

GSM: +2348024093102

Email: shawai@yahoo.com

Abstract

It is worthy of note that this study examined the “Role of Government in Providing Food Security in Nigeria: A Study of Kajuru Local Government Area of Kaduna State (2011-2017)” and the accompanying major challenges. Data was collected using primary source and secondary sources. Multi-stage sampling method was used in selecting respondents across ten political wards in Kajuru Local Government Area. Quantitative method of data analysis and descriptive analysis were used using tables, percentages and prose. The study used public choice theory as a guide. The study shows long era of neglect by government as a major cause of food security challenge in the area coupled with insecurity and corruption among others. These have led to increased hunger, poverty, high rural-urban drift and insecurity in the area. The study recommended adequate provision of security, implementation of anti-corruption laws to the latter, effective reduction of poverty, implementation of agricultural programmes at local level through community participation and equitable distribution of amenities and farm inputs at subsidized rates among others to reduce food security challenges in the Area.

Keywords: Food Security, Food Insecurity, Government, Challenges, Neglect.

Introduction

It is pertinent to note that, aside oil, agriculture is the mainstay of Nigeria's economy, where about two-thirds of its labour force is employed and contributes about 40% to Nigeria's GDP (IFAD, 2012). It has about 84 million hectares of arable land but only 40% is cultivated and about 263 billion cubic meters of water-with two of the largest rivers in Africa for irrigation. But irrigation is considerably low at 7%. Nigeria is the largest producer of cassava, yam and cowpea, yet is a food deficit nation and imports grains, livestock and fish among others. Farming is largely subsistence relying on crude tools and seasonal rainfall. Social amenities are inadequate isolating rural farmers from accessing profitable markets (Food Security Portal-Nigeria, 2012).

Consequently, Nigeria was ranked 40th out of 79 on Global Hunger Index (GHI) in 2012 and 156th out of 187 on UNDP Human Development Index in 2011. Over 70% of Nigerians rural dwellers live on less than 1 dollar a day (IFAD, 2012). Less than 5% of Nigerians are food secured, 65% are semi-food secured. Over 30% of Nigerians are facing the problem of food

insecurity (Imonikebe, 2010: 136-143). Nigeria also ranked 91st out of 104 countries on the Global Hunger Index (GHI) in 2015. The World Development Index (2015) estimated that, about 60% of Nigerians live on less than US\$1.25 per day. And out of a total of 187 countries, it ranked 153rd on the 2012 UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) (Amaka, et al, 2016:182-186).

It must be noted that, Nigerian government, have constantly made efforts to tackle food security challenges. They formulate and implement policies and programmes to reduced hunger, unemployment and improved security; bring about development and boost investment at all levels. Despite all these government policies and programmes, Nigeria has remained food insecure as hunger, poverty, malnutrition, unemployment and increased instability have continued unabated.

However, there are divergence views as to the factors responsible for food security problems in Nigeria. Some scholars linked it to the Babangida's Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP); reliance on subsistence farming; insecurity; corruption; inadequate amenities and farming inputs; poverty, overpopulation, rural-urban drift, illiteracy; and natural phenomena.

This study however, examined the challenges affecting government's effort in ensuring food security in Kajuru Local Government Area from 2011 to 2017. It looked at the food security situation in Nigeria; the effects of the food security challenge; the role of government in tackling the challenge and way forward.

Conceptual and Theoretical Issues

According to this study, food security is the right of people and animals to access adequately and affordably food at required quantity, quality and preference to meet their daily dietary, economic and social needs for a better and healthy living now and in the future. While food insecurity is the inability of an individual, a household, a country and animals to either temporarily or persistently, afford or access daily food at required quantity, quality and preference, and to meet their economic and social needs for a better, healthy, and productive life now and in the future. The government is a group most often saddled with constitutional responsibility of providing security, social amenities and the formulation and execution of laws, programmes and policies that affect life generally.

The actions and or inaction of the government as managers of state affairs, directly or indirectly affect the level of food security of a state. It is their duty to provide a safe environment and amenities; training and tools; and executes programmes necessary for the society to remained food secured. But most times, the government is faced with myriad of challenges that affect food security level. However, this study looks at neglect on the part of government as the major impediment to food security in Kajuru Local Government Area.

To add to the above, public choice theorists like James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock used economic principles to analyze people's actions in the political domain. That people are motivated mainly by self-interest in the market place, though most people base some of their actions on their concerns for others. The same thing applies in the political space. Although people acting in the political arena have concern for others, their major motive, whether as voters, politicians, lobbyists, or bureaucrats, is self-interest. They argued that there is a thing called "government failure." That is, there are reasons why government intervention does not achieve the desired effect. One of such and most dominant is self-interest by those managing government or state affairs (Watkins, n.d, para.10&11). They defined public choice as "politics without romance."

This means participants in political arena do not aspire to promote good. Despite the fact that public officials are referred to as “public servants,” they do not faithfully carry out the “will of the people;” though public business, politicians and policy makers are supposed to rise above parochial concerns (Williams, n.d, para.1). Despite the stand of the public choice theorists, government often initiate policies on corruption control, protection of farmers and workers, regulation of businesses, extension of civil rights, environmental protection and establishment of rules on finance and banking among others (Mark, et al,1994).

Methodology

The study draw a sample size of 400 from an estimated population of 148,200 (NBS, 2016) in Kajuru Local Government Area using Yamane Taro’s Model of 1967. Multi-stage cluster sampling method was used in selecting 400 respondents randomly across ten political wards in Kajuru L.G.A- Maro, Idon, Iri, Rimau, Kallah, Kasuwan Magani, Kufana, Kajuru, Buda, and Tantatu. Quantitative method of data analysis and descriptive analysis were used using tables, percentages and prose. 400 questionnaires were issued and 386 were retrieved and used for analysis. The chi-square statistical tool was used to test the hypothesis raised.

Nigeria and Food Security Challenges in the Fourth Republic (2011-2017)

Food and Agriculture Organization (2013) reported that, the interplay of food security variables determines the food security level of an individual, household and of state. Sustainable food security at household level does not necessarily mean food security at national level. As such, when there is availability, accessibility, utilization and stability in food production and distribution at right quantity, quality and varieties that allows for preference for all, food security is said to exist. The reverse would mean food insecurity.

It is argued that, Nigeria is basically an agrarian society as a number of people are into farming though at subsistence level. This contributes 41% to national GDP in 1999 depicting a fall of 24.7% from 65.7% GDP in 1957. This decrease is still on due to poor policy execution. Nigeria’s soil fertility and her climatic conditions allow it to produce a variety of food and cash crops; Nigeria export commodities especially in 1960’s and early 70’s to Britain, USA, Canada, France and Germany. Cattle herding, fishing, lumbering, weaving, pottery and poultry contribute more than 2% to the GDP in the 1980’s. The United Nations report estimated that Nigerian rural farmers in the north, owned about 26 million goats; 12.2 million cattle; 13.2 million sheep; 1.3 million pigs; 700,000 donkeys; 250, 000 horses and 18,000 camels. Fishing ranges from 600,000 to 700,000 tons annually in the 70’s. But statistics shows that all these have declined to its lowest level (Akinwumi, 2015).

However, there are many damning reports that showed Nigeria to be lagging behind in terms of food security. For instance, report put the number of hungry Nigerians at over 50 million, just less than 3% of the country’s total population of 160 million, out of which about 52% live under poverty line. Nigeria was self-sufficient in production and a net exporter of food. But things got worse following global economic crisis of late 70’s coupled with the discovery of oil and increasing revenue. Consequently, the food sector was neglected turning Nigeria into a net food importer. By 2009, Nigeria was spending over \$3billion annually on food importation.

Although, agriculture provides about 42%GDP, employment and means of livelihood for more than 80% population, it receives less than 10% annual budget allocations. More worrisome is

that, “Nigeria spends only 3% or less of her budget on agriculture.” Other smaller countries do far better. Rwanda, Tanzania, Kenya, Malawi and Mozambique spend between 10 -15 % or more in agriculture. Agricultural production is extremely low in Nigerian farms. Average yield of seed crops is approximately 1 ton per hectare. Only 1% of Nigerian farmers use modern seeds. “Nigeria presently uses 13 kilogram per hectare of fertilizer” while the global average is 100 kilogram. China is close to 400 per hectare. Most of the food produce comes from expanded cultivated areas not from increased productivity per unit area. What Nigeria produces is often lost to poor storage and processing facilities. Consequently, Nigeria is the largest importer of tomatoes from China and Italy despite having it in abundance but often waste away. Nigeria incurred a total food import bill of \$4.2billion (N638.4b) annually to neglect of agriculture (Akinwumi, 2015).

Nigeria ranked 152nd out of 187 on the 2013 UNDP Human Development Index, 39th out of 78 on the 2013 Global Hunger Index and with 10 million Nigerian children suffering from stunting and underweight due to micronutrients deficiency. Government’s efforts to achieve development will amount to nothing if there are no efforts to improve Human Development Index (HDI) through execution of policies to improve citizens’ food and nutrition security (Ogunmola, 2014). Nigeria reportedly have low energy intake of 1730Kcal and an average protein supply of 64g capita per day which is far below the recommended 2500 –3400Kcal minimum daily intake. This means Nigeria today is faced with the challenge of deficient balanced diet. Out of 109 nations examined by Global Food Security Index (GFSI) in 2015, Nigeria was placed 91st with 37.1 score on affordability, availability, quality and safety indices. The failure of Nigerian local food production to meet increasing food demand, made government resort to food importation. Hence, food import rose from 19.9% in 2000 to about 30.6% and 22.7% in 2011and 2012 respectively. Food export remained low at 5.3% as shown by World Development Indicator, 2016 (Amaka et al, 2016:182-186).

According to El-Kurebe (2012), “in all spheres of development, Nigeria has traces of failure that calls for drastic measures to improve the country’s failing economy status...” Out of 105 nations examined by GFSI Economist Intelligence Unit, Nigeria is the 80th with about 34.8% based on affordability, availability, quality and safety indices. Nigeria in this report ranked weak with less than 25% in the following areas: 0.0% in public expenditure on agricultural research and development; 0.0% in food safety net programs; 3.0% in gross domestic product per capita; 9.6% in proportion of population under global poverty line; 9.6% in food consumption as share of household expenditure; and 12.8% on protein quality. Comparatively, South Africa ranked 40th (61.7%) who scored about 18.8% low in gross domestic product per capita.

But scored as high as 72.8% in sufficiency of food supply; 66.7% on political stability risk; 66.5% in proportion of population under global poverty line; 61.1% on agricultural infrastructure; 55.8% on volatility of agricultural production; and 50.0% on access to financing for farmers; 50.0% in public expenditure on agricultural research and development; 43.9% on diet diversification; 41.4% on protein quality; and 38% on micro nutrient availability. In addition, South Africa on affordability ranked 38th (61.1%); 33rd (63.6%) on availability; and 52nd (57.9%) on quality and safety. Whereas, Nigeria on affordability, ranked 103th (15.4%); 50th (51.5%) on availability; and 84th (37.2%) on quality and safety. Nigeria only scored high in areas of volatility of agricultural production and micronutrient availability. It revealed that food insecurity problem is

very serious in Nigeria as World Bank data shows over 90% of Nigerian farm produce comes from small rural farms. UNICEF statistics claim that over 65% of Nigerian population is food insecure (Evans, 2011).

Meanwhile, the above scenario is caused by a number of issues variously discussed by researchers. For instance, Imonikebe (2010:136-143), Akinwumi (2015) and Amaka, et al (2016:182-186) agreed on a number of factors as the major challenges of sustainable food security in Nigeria. Firstly, they argued that in the 1960's and 70's, Nigeria depend solemnly on agricultural production to generate revenue until the discovery of oil. But due to poor government policies, the food sector among others were neglected and farmers' needs were not properly treated; agricultural research and development slowed down; policies were rapidly designed with little or no participation by farmers; incentives for increased food production were neglected. Land scarcity made urban farming difficult. Secondly, Nigeria basically depends on subsistent farming; simple tools; small farms; and credit loans are inadequate; poor storage facilities; poor markets and exploitation of farmers by middle men. There is poor technology; and poverty and illiteracy affects farmer's access to information among others.

Thirdly, is increased population where population of Nigeria and demand for food is higher than food supply. And a number of the productive youth live in abject poverty and migrate to the city for greener pastures. Fourthly, Nigeria is faced with incidents of drought, erosion, desertification, and flooding among other problems. Climate change affects food supply through loss of farm land; fluctuate food prices; increases food borne illnesses among others. For example, in 2012, Nigeria experienced high rainfall which led to flooding that destroyed crops, livestock, properties and humans. Amaka et al (2016:182-186) estimated that, about 2.6 trillion was lost. It reduced the total share of agriculture to GDP from 23.89% in 2010 to 22.05% in 2012 (WDI, 2014). Lastly, Nigeria is faced with high corruption that has distorted national development. This has led to siphoning of monies budgeted for public utilities and security into private use. Consequently, rural infrastructures decay which affect majority of farmers.

It is worthy of note that, the above challenges pose a threat to society as a whole as discussed by Ilaboya et al, (2011:180-188). It poses moral and humanitarian threats. There is a link between hunger, poverty and diseases caused by inadequate food supply. Hunger reduces human natural defense against preventable and curable diseases. Nutrition reduce child mortality, improved education, it lays ground for poverty reduction; improve maternal health among others which form a base of MDGs goals. Hunger limits a nation's economic, social, environmental and political development. It poses also, development threats as it erased long time economic achievements, putting in danger present investments to improve education, health, nutrition and community development in poor countries.

Consequently, they are at risk of witnessing a physically and mentally stunted and disable generation in constant need of help. And lastly, it poses strategic threats. Food insecurity affects the growth and stability of poor nations due to high food and fuel prices. It affects their economic power and reduced their strength to produce or import enough food to meet their population need.

The Role of Government Aimed at Tackling Food Security Challenges in Nigeria

There have been individual and collaborative efforts at local, regional and international levels by governments and non-government bodies to reduce food challenges. These include New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) which launched the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) in 2001 to assist in launching "Green Revolution" across Africa; African Development Bank (ADB); United State Agency for International Development (USAID) which provide about \$89 million to Nigeria for agriculture, education and health and it partnered with Chi Farms and Niji Foods; World Bank; International Monetary Fund (IMF); International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) invested \$377.6 million in 11 projects that impacted 3,784,680 households. It has been a Nigerian partner since 1985; International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) is a partnership working to reduce poverty and ensure food security in Sub-Saharan Africa; the US, Bill&Melinda Gate Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and USAID, invested \$280 million on Partnership for Inclusive Agricultural Transformation in Africa (PIATA) in 2017 in Cote D'Ivoire to ensure income and food security improvement of about 30 million small farmers in 11 nations in Africa (Jimoh,2017).

Some home grown government food security programmes and initiatives in Nigeria from 1960 to date include: National Development Plans(1&2); Operation Feed the Nation; African Development Bank (ADB); Green Revolution; River Basin Development Authorities (RBDA); Directorate of Foods, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI); Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP); Bank of Agriculture (BOA) from 1960-1999 (Opata,2014:334-341). Presidential Initiative on Rice; National Poverty Eradication Programme Scheme (NAPEP); Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP), Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES), Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme (RIDS), Social Welfare Service Scheme (SOWESS), National Resources Development and Conservation Scheme (NRDCS), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), the FADAMA I, II&III Project, Cassava Initiative among others (1999-2007).

President Umaru Musa Yar'adua came with the 7 Point Agenda in 2007 and the Nigerian National Rice Development Strategy Plan NRDSP(2009); the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) by Goodluck Jonathan(2011-2015); and Agriculture Anchor Borrowers Programme (ABP) 2015 to date by Mohammedu Buhari, etc (Chinedum,2011, Kerley,2014, Oyetunji,2017 and Adebayo,2017).

In summary, to Chinedum (2011:45-53), Nigeria's agricultural policies right from independence to fourth republic, aimed at achieving food security; increase production and productivity; income and employment generation; and exports expansion and food imports reduction to free resources for critical social goods development and effective social service delivery.

However, reality today shows that little have been achieved from the above set goals. Hunger and malnutrition, low production and productivity, increasing unemployment and poverty, high rate of importation as against export are the order of the day. In addition, agriculture has remained subsistent and unattractive; a venture for the poor.

Analysis:

Table 1: Government Neglect as a Major Food Security Challenge in Kajuru L.G.A

Variables	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Yes	349	90.4
No	37	9.6
Total	386	100

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 1 indicates that 90.4% of the respondents say ‘Yes,’ that neglect of agriculture by the government is a major challenge of food security in Kajuru Local Government Area, while 9.6% say “No.”

This shows that neglect on the part of the government is a major challenge of food security in Kajuru Local Government Area. This is reflected on the absence of adequate basic social amenities; inadequate supply of subsidized modern farm inputs; lack of security; poor funding and implementation of agricultural programmes in rural areas; poor awareness and sensitization; lack of direct community participation among others.

Table 2: The Effects of Food Security Challenges in Kajuru Local Government Area

Variables	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Increasing poverty	93	24.1
Low level of education	31	8
Increased hunger, malnutrition, diseases and mortality rates	30	7.8
High rural-urban drift	50	13
High crime rates and insecurity	50	13
All of the above	132	34.1
Total	386	100

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 2 reveals that, 24.1% of the respondents indicated increasing poverty as the major effect of food security challenges; 8% low level of education; 7.8% increased hunger and malnutrition; 13% high rural-urban drift; 13% high crime rates and insecurity; while 34.1% indicated all of the above as major effects of food security challenges.

These factors above, affect the people despite the existence of government intervention programmes like Local Economic Empowerment Development Programme, Poverty Alleviation Programme, FADAMA I, II&III, Agricultural Transformation Agenda, Anchor Borrowers among others as discussed in page 11 of this study. This failure could be attributed to negligence, greed and corruption by government saddled with the mandate of handling these programmes as argued by Imonikebe (2010:136-143), Akinwumi (2015) and Amakaetal, (2016:182-186) earlier in pages 1,7&8 of this study.

Hypothesis Testing Decision Rule:

If calculated X^2 value is greater than the X^2 table value, we accept H_1 (alternate or directional hypothesis) and reject H_0 (null hypothesis) and if calculated X^2 value is less than X^2 table value, we accept H_0 (null hypothesis) and reject H_1 (alternate hypothesis).

Table 3: X^2 Test for Neglect on the part of Government as a Major Challenge of Food Security in Kajuru Local Government Area (2011-2017).

Sex	Yes	No	Total
Male	Fo=201 Fe=189.9	Fo=9 Fe= 20.1	210
Female	Fo=148 Fe= 159.1	Fo = 28 Fe = 16.9	176
Total	349	37	386

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

$$X^2 = 14.84$$

Hence, using the 0.05 level of significance, table value $X^2=3.84$ and the calculated $X^2=14.84$. The H_0 (null hypothesis) is therefore rejected since calculated value of $X^2 >$ critical table value of X^2 (calculated $X^2 = 14.84$ is greater than table value of $X^2 =3.84$). We therefore, accept H_1 (the directional or alternate hypothesis) that neglect on the part of government is a major challenge to food security in Kajuru Local Government Area (2011-2017).

Summary and Conclusion

This study was carried out to examine the challenges confronting food security in Kajuru Local Government Area. It discussed conceptual issues; it looked at Nigeria and food security challenges, causes and the attending effects; the role government played to bring about food security within the period under study; it used the public choice theory to back the argument that government negligence is responsible for the increasing food challenges in the area. The hypothesis raised tested positive. About 90.4% of respondents agreed that government negligence is the major issue affecting food security and the calculated chi-square value stood at 14.84 higher than table value of 3.84.

Hence, the study concludes that, there is long era of neglect by the government which is shown in the poor state and shortage of social amenities; policies inconsistencies, inadequate supply of subsidized modern farm inputs; increasing insecurity manifesting through incessant ethno-religious clashes, kidnapping, banditry and indigene/settler tussles; high food prices and corruption where funds and inputs set for agricultural programmes and for provision of public goods are siphoned for private use. This was supported by Imonikebe (2010:136-143), Akinwumi (2015) and Amaka, et al (2016:182-186) in pages 7 and 8 of this study. These have generally affected farming and halts economic activities leading to hunger, poverty, rural-urban drift; high mortality rates, illiteracy and the general insecurity in Kajuru Local Government Area among others.

Recommendations

Base on this research findings, some recommendations are proposed that will help in addressing to a greater level some of the challenges of food security in Kajuru Local Government Area and the nation at large:

- i. The government must ensure the adequate provision of security to all people by protecting lives and property against ethno-religious clashes, kidnapping, farmers/herdsmen clashes, cattle rustling, robbery and indigene/settler tussle through sensitization on the dangers of conflicts.
- ii. There should be strict implementation of anti-corruption laws to the latter to serve as a deterrent to others without fear or favor.
- iii. The government must provide basic social amenities and farm inputs to help reduce rural-urban drift and boost agricultural and economy activities.

References

- Adebayo, H. (2017) "How Buhari's Agric Programme is Creating Jobs, Pushing Nigeria towards Self-sufficiency in Rice." Premium Times, Monday 8, January 2018. <https://www.premiumtimesng.com>. Retrieved 18/5/18, 6:14AM.
- Akinwumi, A. (2015) "Food Security and National Development." The Nigerian Observers, April 22nd, 2017. <https://www.nigerianobserversnews.com/2015/03/food-security-and-national-development>. Retrieved 7/4/2018, 6:16 AM.
- Amaka, G. Metu, Kenechukwu O. Okeyika and Olisa D. Maduka (2016) "Achieving Sustainable Food Security in Nigeria: Challenges and Way Forward." Department of Economics,

- Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. 3rd International Conference on African Development Issues. Pp 182-186.
- Chinedum, N. (2011) "Nigeria Agriculture and Food Security Challenges." *Agriculture & Food Security Journal*. Pp 45-53.
- El-Kurebe, A. (2012) "Food Security Challenges: Biotechnology to the Rescue." *Vanguard Newspaper*, October 16, 2012.
- Evans, O. (2011) "Food Insecurity: Implications for Nigeria and the World at Large." Department of Economics University of Lagos, Economic Updates, Tuesday, June 11th, 2011.
- FOA, (2016) "Nigerian Food Security and Vulnerability Survey Report." 30th November. Retrieved 23/4/2017, 6:05 PM.
- Food Security Portal-Nigeria, (2012). <https://www.foodsecurityportal.org> PM. Pp 1-3.
- <https://www.usaid.gov>. Retrieved 10/6/2018, 9:12 PM.
- <https://www.iita.org>. Retrieved 10/6/2018, 9:51PM.
- IFAD Report (2012). <https://www.ifad.org> Retrieved 8/4/2018, 10:20 PM.
- Ilaboya, I.R, Atikpo, E., Omofuma, F.E, Asekhame, F.F, & Umukora, L (2012) "Causes, Effects and Way Forward to Food Insecurity." *Iranica Journal of Energy and Environment*, 3(2): Pp180-188.
- Imonikebe, B. U. (2010) "Constraints to Food Security in Nigeria and Implications." *African Research Review International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, Ethiopia, Vol.4 (4), NO.17, Home Economics Unit, Vocational Education Department, Delta State University, Awka, Nigeria. Pp 136-143.
- Jimoh, B. (2017, 5th September). <https://www.vanguardngr.com>. Retrieved 11/6/2018.
- Jane S. Shaw,(n.d)"Public Choice Theory."The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics, 1st Edition. <http://www.econlib.org>. Retrieved 20/3/2020. 1:20PM.
- Kerley, G. (2014) "The Goodluck Jonathan's Legacy, Nigeria's Prosperity." *Thewillnigeria.com*. Retrieved 12/6/2018, 11: 12 PM.
- Mark, S., Fontanini, J.(1994)"Public Choice Theory and the Role of Government in thePast."<https://socialstudies.org>. Retrieved 20/3/2020. 10:06AM.

Ogunmola, T. (2014) "How can Nigeria Ensure Food Security." Leadership Newspaper, September 8th, 2014.

Opata, C. C., (2014) "Nigeria and the Search for Food Security since Amalgamation." Department of History and International Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria, Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science, Vol.3 (11). Pp. 334-341.

Oyetunji, N. A. (2017) "Examining Buhari's Agricultural Policy." Economic Confidential, January 15, 2017.

Watkins, T., (n.d) "Public Choice Theory!" www.sjsu.edu. Retrieved 20/3/2020. 11:00AM.

William F. S. II, (n.d) "Public Choice." <https://www.econlib.org>. Retrieved 20/3/2020. 12:15PM.

World Bank Report (2012). <https://www.foodsecurityportal.org>. Retrieved 6/4/2018, 8:07 PM.
World Development Indicator Report, 2016.

APPENDIX

To obtain the Degree of Freedom:

$$Df = (C_t - 1) (R_t - 1)$$

$$Df = (2 - 1) (2 - 1)$$

$$Df = 1 \times 1 = 1.$$

$$Df = 1.$$

Level of significance is 0.05.

Calculation for Chi-Square

$$\text{Formula: } X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

X^2 = Chi-square. O = Observed frequency. E = Expected frequency. \sum = Summation)

$$(1). X^2 = \frac{(201 - 189.9)^2}{189.9} + \frac{(148 - 159.1)^2}{159.1} + \frac{(9 - 20.1)^2}{20.1} + \frac{(28 - 16.9)^2}{16.9}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(11.1)^2}{189.9} + \frac{(-11.1)^2}{159.1} + \frac{(-11.1)^2}{20.1} + \frac{(11.1)^2}{16.9}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{123.21}{189.9} + \frac{123.21}{159.1} + \frac{123.21}{20.1} + \frac{123.21}{16.9}$$

$$X^2 = 0.65 + 0.77 + 6.13 + 7.29$$

$$X^2 = 14.84$$

Calculation for Expected Frequency

$$\text{Formula: } Fe = \frac{(Ct) \cdot (Rt)}{Gt}$$

(Fe = Expected Frequency. Ct = Column total. Rt = Row total. Gt = Grand total)

1. Cell A: $Fe = \frac{349 \cdot 210}{386}$

$$Fe = \frac{73290}{386}$$

$$Fe = 189.9$$

Cell B: $Fe = \frac{349 \cdot 176}{386}$

$$Fe = \frac{61424}{386}$$

$$Fe = 159.1$$

Cell C: $Fe = \frac{37 \cdot 210}{386}$

$$Fe = \frac{7770}{386}$$

$$Fe = 20.1$$

Cell D: $Fe = \frac{37 \cdot 176}{386}$

$$\begin{aligned} & 386 \\ \text{Fe} = & \frac{6512}{386} \\ \text{Fe} = & 16.9 \end{aligned}$$

