Assessment of Small Scale Farmers Membership of Farmers Groups and Access to Credit In Atyap Chiefdom of Zangon Kataf LGA, Kaduna State

Manza, E.A.G.[1], Makarau, S.B.[1], Garba, T.K.[2], Banta, A.L.[1] and Yabaya, S.A.[1]

1. Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension, Kaduna State University, Kafanchan Campus, Kafanchan.
2. Development Finance Office, Central Bank of Nigeria, Jos Branch, Jos.
rhodelgevan@yahoo.com

Abstract

The objectives of the study were to assess farmers membership of groups and examine farmers access to farm credit in Atyap chiefdom of Zangon Kataf LGA of Kaduna State. Multistage sampling technique was used to select the respondents and to collect data from 149 farmers for the study. Chi-square and descriptive statistics involving the use of frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were employed for data analysis also. Findings from the study revealed that only 27.7% of the respondents were members of a cooperative society who joined a cooperative society to achieve processing of their farm produce with minimal cost and to sell their farm produce with a good price. Those who did not join a cooperative was due to the fact that there was no cooperative nearby, they had no idea of what a cooperative is all about and 22.8% of the respondents had access to credit. Sources of credit to famers included cooperative societies, friends, relations and also from personal savings. The amounts were low with the highest loans within the range of ₦100,001 – ₦120,000. Challenges faced in getting the loan in 2014 included delay, cumbersome loan procedures, high interest loans, insufficient credit and lack/inadequate collateral. It is suggested that there is the need for sensitization on the importance of farmers' groups, farm credit and relevant agricultural technology. It is recommended that the Atyap Community Development Association in collaboration with the Zangon Kataf Local Government Council to organize seminars and workshops on farmers' groups, credit and agricultural technology. The study also recommended an impact of the Nenzit Microfinance bank with respect to its lending to the agricultural sector in the area.

Keywords: *Cooperatives/Farmer groups, Respondents, Credit/loan, Small farmers, Atyap Chiefdom.*

Introduction

Various authors have defined cooperatives differently and usually based on their background. Some view cooperatives as a business voluntarily owned and controlled by member patrons and operated by them on non profit basis. Cooperative business usually evolves out of the felt needs of members who want to solve their common problems by pooling their limited resources together; for example, in marketing a farm produce like mango or getting supplies of farm inputs like fertilizer or agrochemicals (Olukosi and Insitor, 1999; Adetunji, 2011).

Cooperative, to some other authors, is a legal practical means by which a group of self selected individuals seek to improve their individual economic positions in a cooperative society. No matter how one looks at the definitions given above, two things are common (i) a cooperative is a legal, institutionalized device which permits group action that can compete within the framework of other types of

business organizations. (ii) Cooperatives are voluntarily organized to serve and benefit those who are going to use them (Rapp,1999 in Manza, 2014).

Regardless of the type, size, geographical location, or purpose, all cooperatives provide at least one of the following

a. Improve bargaining power when dealing with other business – combining the volume of several members to leverage their position;

b. Reduce costs – volume purchasing reduces the purchase price of needed supplies. Earnings of the cooperative are returned to individual members at lower than net costs;

c. Obtain product or services otherwise unavailable – services or products that would not attract private business are often supplied by cooperatives;

d. Obtain market access or broaden market opportunities – value added to products by processing, thereby offering larger quantity of an assured type and quality attracts more buyers;

e. Improve product or service quality – value added to their products, competition, and improve facilities and equipment increase members satisfaction, and

f. Increase income – distribution of the cooperative's earnings boost the income of members.

g. Provide cross-guarantee to address the challenge of inadequate collateral for individual borrowing.

In summary, the objective of any cooperative society will be to have a better bargaining power, have unique products, reduce costs, increase volume, obtain market access and improve quality of products/services (Rapp, 1999).

A number of problems have been identified in cooperation. The most prominent or common of these according to Gandhi and Marsh (2003) include illiteracy and ignorance of members, disloyalty among officials and employees of the societies, low membership, poor capital base and high rate of loan default.

Iheduru (2002) and Ocholi (2011) in Ocholi and Nyiatagher (2014), asserted that lack of finance is one of the major constraints to agricultural development in Nigeria. This is because Nigeria's farming system is traditional in nature and is characterized by low capital which leads to low productivity and meager savings from agricultural investments. It is in realization of this that successive governments in Nigeria made several attempts aimed at bridging the financial gap among rural dwellers. These among others include the establishment of the Nigerian Agricultural and Cooperative Bank (NACB) in 1973 now Bank of Agriculture (BOA), the introduction of the Rural Banking Scheme (RBS) in June, 1977, the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund (ACGSF) in April, 1978, the People's Bank in 1989 and Community Banking in 1990 (now Microfinance Banks) and more recently the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Fund (MSMEDF) in August, 2013.

To attain the targeted annual five percent growth in agriculture, Nigerian financial systems among others need to be addressed. Promoting an efficient, sustainable and widely accessible rural financial system remains a major development challenge in most sub Sahara African countries. With about 73% of Africa's population living in the rural areas and experiencing a high incidence of rural poverty, improved rural finance is crucial in achieving pro poor growth and poverty reduction goals. However, the development of rural financial systems is hampered by the high cost of delivering the services to small, widely dispensed customers; as well as a difficult financial terrain – characterized by high covariant risks, missing markets for risk management instruments and lack of suitable collateral (Robinson, 2002 and Rapisura,2008).

Lack of working capital and low liquidity limit the farmers' ability to purchase productivity- enhancing inputs like seeds, fertilizers and pesticide. In spite of the relatively high adoption rates of inputs like fertilizers, the quantities used are low and therefore, hybrid variety crops that are dependent on fertilizers may not attain their potential production capacities. According to Diagne and Zeller (2002), the average production efficiency levels are higher among producers who have access to formal credit. According to Kibaara, 2005 access to credit resulted to higher technical efficiency in maize production in Kenya.

Rural financial services refer to all financial services extended to agricultural and non agricultural activities in rural areas; these services include money deposit & savings, loans, money transfer, sale deposit and insurance. Demanders/beneficiaries of rural financial services are mainly households, producers, input stockists/suppliers, traders, agro-processors and service providers. Rural financial services help the poor and low income households increase their incomes and build the assets that allow them to mitigate risk, smoothen consumption, plan for the future, increase food consumption, invest in education and other life cycle needs (Kibaara,2005).

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study was to assess membership of agricultural cooperatives and other farmer groups and farmers access to credit by small scale farmers. Specifically, the study was designed to:
1. assess farmers membership of groups, and
2. examine farmers access to farm credit

Methodology

The Study Area

The study area was Atyap chiefdom of Zangon Kataf Local Government Area of Kaduna State. Zangon Kataf LGA has four chiefdoms namely: Atyap chiefdom, Bajju chiefdom, Ikulu chiefdom, and Kamantan chiefdom. The Atyap chiefdom has 16 districts namely Gidan Zaki, Ung. Ruhogo, Takanai, Zonzon, Zango Urban, Kibori, Zaman Dabo, Mayii aghui, Gora Bafai, Gora Gan, Ung. Gaiya, Mabushi,

Jankasa, Magamiya, Gora Gida and Manchong districts. Zangon Kataf LGA lies between Latitude 9^0 12' and Longitude $10^0$2'E. It is bounded in the North by Kachia LGA, in the South by Kaura LGA, in the West by Lere and Kauru LGAs, and in the East by Jema'a LGA. The Atyap chiefdom is located between Latitude 9^0 40^1 and 10^0 North and Longitude 8^0 15' and 8^0 40' East.

Sampling Techniques/Sample Size
There was multistage sampling. The stage involved the purposive sampling of Atyap Chiefdom. The second stage involved the random selection of five out of 16 districts in the chiefdom. The third stage involved the random selection of three villages from each of the five districts. The fourth and final stage involved the selection of 29-31 households from the three villages using random sampling technique. Atyap chiefdom was purposively selected. Five out of the 16 districts were selected at random. The five districts selected were Zonzon, Ung. Gaiya, Jankasa, Gidan Zaki and Gora Bafai. In each of the five districts, 29 – 31 households were also selected at random to give a total of 149 households.

Method of Data Collection
A structured questionnaire was developed and used to elicit relevant information from the households. Trained enumerators were used to solicit for the information from the farmers under the supervision of the researchers.

Analytical Techniques
Data collected were analyzed using frequencies and percentages on the occurrence of certain responses. Also chi square test of Independence was used. The chi square test for independence of two variables is a test which uses a cross classification table to examine the nature of the relationship between these variables. These tables show the manner in which the two variables are either related or are not related to each other. The test for independence examines whether the observed pattern between the variables in the table is strong enough to show that the two variables are dependent on each other or not. The chi square statistics and distribution were used in this test. This test is concerned with the relationship between two variables. The chi square test for independence is conducted by assuming that there is no relationship between the two variables being examined. The alternative hypothesis is that there are some relationships between the variables. One way to consider a relationship between two variables is to imagine that one variable affects or influences another variable. The chi square test of independence begins with the hypothesis of no association, or no association, between the two variables. The two variables e.g X and Y are defined as being independent variables if the probability of the occurrence of one category of variable Y occurs. If the probability of occurrence of the different possible values of variable X depend on which category of variable Y occurs, then the two variables X and Y are dependent on each other.

The test of independence of X and Y begins by assuming that there is no relationship between the two variables. The alternative hypothesis states that there is some relationship between the two variables. If the two variables in the cross classification are X and Y, the hypotheses are:

H_0: No relationship between X and Y

H_1: Some relationship between X and Y

The chi square statistics used to conduct this test is

$$x^2 = \sum_j \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

(1)

Where:

o_j is the observed number of cases in each cell of the cross tabulation table representing the number of respondents that take on each of the various combinations of values for the two variables and e_j is the expected numbers of cases for each of the cell can be obtained from the multiplication rule of probability for independent events.

From the x^2 table, the critical value is obtained. This is based on the level of significance and the degrees of freedom which is the number of row minus one time the number of columns minus 1. If the chi square statistics exceeds the critical chi square value, reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between the two variables. If the chi square statistics does not exceed the critical value, then do not reject the null hypothesis and there is no relationship between the two variables.

The only restriction on the use of this test is that the expected number of cases should exceed 5 in most cells of the cross classification table (Spiegel, 1961).

Conceptual Framework

In a study by Ezeano (2014), it was found that membership of social organizations was negative and insignificant in influencing adoption of rabbit technologies. It was also found in the same study that the majority 53.3% of the respondents belonged to 1-2 groups while 18.4% belonged to 3-4 groups with only 28.3% of the respondents belonging to any group. The multiple regression analysis on the relationship between socio-economic variables and adoption of improved rabbit technologies, membership of social organization had a coefficient of -0.13 with a standard error of 0.09 and a t-value of -0.13 proved not significant even at 10% level of significance.

Babalola and Kazeem (2013) in determining the total factor productivity among fluted pumpkin farmers in Ikenne LGA of Ogun State found that membership of a community based organization (CBO) had a beta coefficient of 0.180 and a t-value of 1.93 which was significant at 10% in the Double log Multiple Regression results for the determinants of the total factor productivity.

Matanmi and Popoola (2014) in their regression analysis found that membership of a catfish association had a coefficient of -0.737 and t-value of -2.749. This was found to be significant at 5%. In view of this, they recommended that small scale catfish farmers should come together to form cooperative unions to facilitate their access to credit, other inputs and to complement individual efforts.

Ibrahim *et al.* (2014) found that membership of clubs, associations or cooperatives availed a farmer the opportunity of not only obtaining credit and agricultural inputs but also information on how to improve farming activities. Out of the 120 respondents, 84 (70%) did not belong to any group, 9 (7%) belonged to groups with 1-5 members, 17 (14%) belonged to groups with 6-9 members, 7 (6%) belonged to groups with 10-15 members while 3 (3%) belonged to groups who had 16-20 members.

Anozie *et al.* (2014) found that the cost of the loan (interest rate) was among the factors which significantly determined loan disbursement to yam farmers. The double log regression result showed that interest had a coefficient of 0.496 which was significant at 1% significant level. This was positive implying that interest on loan determines the level farmers in obtaining loans. The higher the rate, the more banks were eager to give loans. On the contrary, the lower the interest rate the more yam farmers were eager to obtain loans. While Iheduru (2012) in Anozie *et al.* (2014) had reported that decrease in cost of loans encourage farmers to obtain loan and facilitates adoption of innovation and enhances marketing efficiency, Okoh *et al.* (2009) in Anozie *et al.* (2014) reported that receiving credit due to decrease in interest rate contributed to farmers' economic inefficiency.

Looking at the distribution of farmers according to problems encountered in obtaining loans from a microfinance bank, 67% of the respondents reported default in loan repayment, 63% due to wrong completion of application form by farmers, 68% due to farmers not providing the necessary security, 71% due to lack of personnel to supervise farms, 79% insufficient fund, 50% farmers did not apply on time and 42% as a result of illiteracy.

Babalola and Kazeem (2013) found access to credit to have a beta coefficient of 0.074 and a t-value of 1.86 which was significant at 10% in the Double log Multiple Regression results for determinants of total factor productivity of flutted pumpkin farmers.

Matanmi and Popoola (2014) found that out of 120 respondents only 17 (14.2%) had access to credit while 103 (85.8%) had none. In terms of credit category, 103 respondents (85.8%) had no access to loan, 4 (3.3%) received bank loans, 10 (8.3%) received a loan from a cooperative society while 3 (3.5%) received loans from professional money lenders. Furthermore, other sources of capital aside credit, 17 (14.2%) had access to credit, 92 (76.7%) used personal savings, 8 (6.7%) received donations from their families while 3 (2.5%) received donations from friends. They found that for the various loans collected, the respondents paid interest rates as follows: 7(5.8%) respondents had credit at 5% interest, 2 (1.7%) received

credit at 6-10% interest, 5(4.2%) received credit at 11-15% interest, 1(0.8%) received credit at 16-20% interest while 2(1.7%) received credit with interest at 21% or greater than 21%. The regression analysis showed that access to credit had a coefficient of 0.180 and a t-value of 0.872. This was not found to be significant.

Zubairu and Maurice (2014) result of Logit Regression for relationship between food security status and socio economic variables, found that access to credit (X_6) had a coefficient of -0.332205, standard error of 0.529865 and Z-statistics of -0.626962. This was not sound to be significant at 1%, 5% or 10%. Garba *et al*. (2014) found that 75.75% of the respondents sourced their finance from personal savings, 10.10% from women cooperative societies, 7.8% from banks while relations and money lenders accounted for 4.04%, and 2.53% respectively. Ibrahim *et al*.(2014) found that 64 (53%) received no credit while 30 (25%) received credit of ₦20,000 – ₦100,000, 19 (15%) ₦110,000 – ₦200,000, 5 (5%) ₦210,000 – ₦300,000, 1 (1%) ₦310,000 – ₦400,000, and 1 (1%) ₦410,000 – ₦500,000.

Results and Discussion
Farmers' membership of Groups
Out of a total of 148 respondents, 41 (27.7%) indicated that they belonged to a farmers group while 107 (72.3%) did not belong to any. Of the 41 respondents who belonged to at least one farmers' group, each of the 41 respondents was able to give the name of the farmer group each of them belongs to.

The reasons given by those of them who joined a cooperative society are shown in Table 1. For example, 33.9% indicated that they had done so to be able to sell their farm produce with at a good price. 39.3% of them indicated that they had joined a cooperative society so as to be able to process their farm produce with a minimal cost. While 98.2% might have met their expectations, 1.8% of the respondents indicated that they received no benefit for joining or belonging to a cooperative society.

Though Manza and Makarau (2015) and Ezeano (2014) did not find membership of a cooperative society/social organization to have a negative coefficient and insignificant in their various studies, however, Babalola and Kazeem (2003), and Matanmi and Popoola (2014) had a positive beta coefficient and negative coefficient respectively which were significant at 10% and 5% respectively. Also, Manza and Abdulsalam (2014) in their study found a coefficient of 2.04 and standard error of 0.35 which was significant at 1%.

Of the 72.3% respondents who did not join a cooperative society, 36.5% of them indicated that they had no cooperative society nearby while 30.6% of them indicated they had no idea of what a cooperative society is all about. The other reasons given for not joining a cooperative society show the need to create awareness among the farmers in the Atyap chiefdom on cooperative societies. This would most likely help them to see the need to join a cooperative and thrive towards achieving the benefits therein in cooperative societies.

Apart from cooperative societies, the respondents indicated that they belong to other farmers' groups. For example, of the 131 respondents, 33 (25.2% belonged to other farmers' groups while 98 (74.8%) did not. Majority of the respondents who belonged to other farmer groups indicated membership of Fadama Users Association (54.3%) followed by a marketing group (31.4%). Membership of Fadama Users Association is an indication of increased interest in dry season farming which has been lacking in the past in the Atyap Chiefdom.

Just like in the case of cooperative societies, those respondents who joined these other farmers' groups, 43.5% of them had done so with the hope of obtaining credit/loan from a financial institution. This was followed by those who joined their group to enable them have prompt access to farm inputs. These two major reasons underscore the farmers desire to increase their farm productivity and production by having access to farm credit and other farm inputs which are in short supply. Also, just like in the case of cooperative societies, those farmers who did not join any of the farmers' groups had not done so for a number of reasons. These reasons were similar to those given by respondents for not joining any of the cooperative societies

Farmers Access to Farm Credit

Thirty three (22.8%) of the respondents indicated that they obtained farm credit in 2014 as against 112 (77.2%) who did not. This finding is similar to that by Mantanmi and Popoola (2014) who found that only 4.2% of the respondents had access to credit as against 85.8% of the respondents who did not have access to credit in 2014.

Table 2 shows the result of the finding on farmers' access to farm credit in 2014. Of the 33 respondents (22.8%) who indicated that they had obtained farm credit in 2014, they gave their sources as follows: 10 (26.3%) indicated that their source was a cooperative society, and also 10(26.3%) obtained credit from friends and relations. 10 (26.3%) used their savings for their farm operations. Only 5 (13.2%) and 1 (2.6%) had received credit from Bank of Agriculture and commercial banks respectively. Bank of Agriculture and commercial banks as sources of farm credit in the area in the opinion of the authors are quite low which have the capacity to provide more loans in the number of beneficiaries and in the quantum of credit. Unless reference to a commercial bank meant the Nenzit Microfinance bank which is located within Ung. Gaiya district which was one of the districts selected for this study, its impact on its immediate community and the larger community is lacking. This finding agrees with that of Garba *et al.* (2014) who found that 75.5% of the respondents sourced their finance from personal savings, 10.10% from cooperative societies, 7.8% from banks while relations and money lenders accounted for 4.04% and 2.53% respectively.

The quantum of loan received was also found to be relatively low. For example, the mean loan received by respondents who had access to a loan was

N53,409, a standard deviation of 29736.39 and a variance of 884253246.75. The minimum loan was found to be ₦10,000 with 22.7% of the respondents receiving loan between N1-N20,000.The maximum loan was ₦120,000 with only 4.1% of the respondents who had received loans between N100,001-N200,000. Even at the maximum loan of ₦120,000 which was available to the respondents, this was most likely to have been quite inadequate to meet some of the critical needs on farm for inputs such as inorganic fertilizer, agrochemicals and for hired labour especially where family labour was lacking as some of the family members were either at school or had left to the city. Manza and Makarau (2015) had found the mean household size in the study area to be 7.5 with a standard deviation of 3.3. This finding is similar to that of Ibrahim et al. (2014) who found that 53% of their respondents received no credit while 25% received ₦20,000 – ₦100,000, 15% received ₦110,000 – ₦200,000, 5% received ₦210,000 – ₦300,000 while 1% received ₦310,000 – ₦400,000 and ₦410,00 – ₦500,000 respectively. Manza and Abdulsalam (2014) though had a positive beta coefficient of 0.32 for access to credit (X_{11}) and a standard error of 0.52 in their result of the logit regression analysis of the determinants of household food security, this was not significant even at 10%. Similarly, Manza and Makarau (2015) found a beta coefficient of 0.166 and S.E of 0.748 for access to credit (X_{14}). This too was not significant at even 10%.

The respondents encountered some challenges in getting loans in 2014. For example, 48.9% of the respondents who received loans had some delay in obtaining the loan. Though this ought to have been a characteristic of formal institutions, the delay had come from other sources also. High interest rates charged, insufficient credit and inadequate collateral or the lack of it which might have affected negatively the quantum of loan received were some of the other challenges faced by the respondents.

Over the years, particularly for the period 2010 – 2014, farmers in the area experienced difficulty in obtaining farm credit. The result is found in Table 3. For example, in 2010 of the 149 respondents studied, 133 (89.3%) had difficulty in obtaining farm credit as against 16 (10.7%) who did not. The percentage of those who indicated they experienced difficulty in accessing farm credit had reduced to 85.9% in 2014. This may have been due to their membership of farmer groups because credit from cooperative societies was one of the major sources of credit in the area. This could also have been due to increased lending by the Nenzit Microfinance bank even though there was no evidence for this even though the researchers did not make an attempt to find out from the bank.

 The result of the chi square test of independence shows that there is association between farmers who experienced problems in obtaining farm credit during the years i.e 2010 to 2014.This means that farmers experienced problems in obtaining farm credit every year

Conclusion

Only very few respondents indicated that they belong to one farmers group or the other. The greater majority of the respondents had shown that they lack awareness on the importance of farmer groups in general and cooperative societies in particular. Farmers access to institutional credit was found to be too low inspite of the presence of the bank of agriculture and commercial banks at Kafanchan and Zonkwa; the Nenzit Microfinance bank at Samaru Kataf and the Legacy Microfinance bank at Zonkwa thus allowing most of the respondents to access credit from cooperative societies, friends and relations and from personal savings. Credit was generally low in quantum.

Recommendations

1. There is the urgent need for the Atyap Community Development Association (ACDA) as part of its duty to the community to organize seminars and workshops in order to sensitize the farmers on cooperatives and farm credit.
2. There is the need for a study on the impact of the Nenzit Microfinance bank with respect to its lending activities to the agricultural sector, more so that over 70% of the inhabitants of the chiefdom have agriculture as their major livelihood.
3. Seminars and workshops on relevant agricultural technology in the area should be carried out by the ACDA in collaboration with Zangon Kataf LGA and the Samaru zone of Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project (KADP).
4. There is also the need for the cooperatives to be sensitized to borrow not only for production but for the value chain, i.e local processing, marketing and distribution.

Table 1: Farmers Join Cooperative Society For Different Reason

Reason	Frequency	Percent	Rank	
Prompt access to farm inputs	4	7.1	4	
To sell farm produce with a good price	19	33.9	2	
To obtain loan/credit	2	3.6	5	
Process farm produce with minimal cost	22	39.3	1	
Other benefit	1	1.8	6	
No benefit	8	14.3	3	
Total	56	100.0		
Why some of the Farmers do not belong to a cooperative society				
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Rank**	
No cooperative society nearby	31	36.5	1	
To avoid external influence	3	3.5	4	
Have no idea what a coop. is all about	26	30.6	2	
Do not have the registration fees	1	1.2	7	
Do not feel like joining a coop. society	6	7.1	4	
Have no time to join a coop. society	14	16.5	3	
Cooperative societies are not reliable	1	1.2	7	
Lack of trust	2	2.4	6	
No benefit	1	1.2	7	
Total	**85**	**100.0**		
Membership of other groups				
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Rank**	
Fadama Users Association	19	54.3	1	
Livestock Farmers' group	3	8.6	3	
Processors	0	0	5	
Marketers	11	31.4	2	
Other groups	2	5.7	4	
Total	**35**	**100.0**		
Reasons for joining the other Farmer groups				
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Rank**	
Prompt access to farm inputs	14	30.4		2
Selling of farm produce with a good price	6	13.0		3
To obtain credit/loan from a financial institution	20	43.5		1
Processing of farm produce with a minimal cost	4	8.7		4
Other reasons	2	4.4		5
Total	**46**	**100.0**		
Why some farmers Do not belong to other groups				
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Rank**	
No group close by	27	34.6		1
Financial constraints	3	3.9		4
Do not feel like	24	30.7		2
No idea	21	26.9		3
No time	3	3.9		4
Total	**78**	**100.0**		

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Table 2: Sources of credit for the 2014 Farming Season in the Study Area

Sources	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Bank of Agriculture	5	13.2	4
Commercial banks	1	2.6	6
Cooperative society	10	26.3	1
Friends and relations	10	26.3	1
Money lenders	2	5.3	5
Personal savings	10	26.3	1
Total	**38**	**100.0**	
Amount of Loan obtained			
In Naira	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Rank**
1-20,000	5	22.7	2
20,001-40,000	3	13.6	4
40,001-60,000	6	27.5	1
60,001-80,000	5	22.7	2
80,001-100,000	2	9.1	5
100,001-120,000	1	4.1	6
Total	**22**	**100.0**	
Minimum loan received	₦10,000		
Maximum loan received	₦120,000		
Mean	₦53,409		
Standard deviation	29736.39		
Variance	884253246.75		
Challenges Faced in Obtaining loan in 2014			
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Rank**
Delay in getting loan	23	48.9	1
High interest rate	8	17.3	2
Insufficient Credit	8	17.3	2
Lack/inadequate collateral	7	14.9	4
Other problems	1	1.6	5
Total	**47**	**100.0**	

Source: Field survey (2015)

Table 3: Farmers who Experienced difficulty in obtaining farm credit in 2010-2014

	2010		2011		2012		2013		2014	
	Freq	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**
Yes	133	89.3	135	90.6	132	88.6	126	84.6	128	85.9
No	16	10.7	14	9.4	17	11.4	23	15.4	21	14.1
Total	**149**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey (2015)

References

Adetunji,M.O.(2011). Cooperative and Credit Support Institutions in Agriculture and Rural Agribusiness in Rural, Agricultural & Environmental Sociology in Nigeria(Edited by Samson F. Adedoyin). Publication of the Nigerian Rural Sociological Association. October.Pp.247-269

Anozie, R.O.; Ume, S.I.; Okelola, O.E.; Anonie, S.N. and Ubani, S.I. (2014). Determinant Factors in Loan Disbursement to Yam (Discorea SPP) Farmers in Ehime Mbano, Imo State, Nigeria: A case study of NSU Microfinance Bank *Taraba Journal of Agricultural Research*. Volume 2 No.1 June, 2014 Pp. 14-18

Babalola, D.A. and Kazeem, O. (2013). Determinants of Farm Productivity Among Flutted Pumpkin (*Telfairia occidentalis*) Farmers in Ikenne Local Government Area of Ogun State *Journal of Research in Agriculture*. Volume 10 No.1, 2014. Pp. 49-54.

Diagne,A. and Zeller,M.(2002). Access to Credit and Its Impact in Malawi. Research Report No.116,Washington,D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Pp.10-12.

Ezeano, C.I. (2014). Constraints on Adoption of Improved Rabbit Technologies by Small Scale Farmers in Oji River Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics*. Volume 3 No.1 June, 2013. Pp.15-24

Gandhi, V.P. and Marsh, R. (2003). Development and Poverty Reduction: Do Institutions Matter? Paper Presented at the 25th International Conference of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) 16th August, 2003, Durban, South Africa. Pp. 1476

Garba, A.; Umar, A.G.; Babuga, U.S. and Ubayo, M.M. (2014). Contributions of Small Scale Women Farmers for Sustainable Agricultural Priduction in Jigawa State, Nigeria *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics* (NIJADE). Volume 4 No.1 June, 2014. Pp.15-21.

Ibrahim, U.W.; Umar, A.S.S. and Usman, S. (2014). Economics of Water Melon (*Citrullus lanatus*) Production in Borno State, Nigeria in *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics* (NIJADE). Volume 4 No.1 June, 2014. Pp.35-42.

Iheduru, N.G. (2002). Women Entrepreneurship and Development, the Gendering of microfinance in Nigeria. Paper presented at the 8th International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women 21-26 July, 2002. Mekerere, Kampala, Uganda.

Kibaara, B. (2005). Rural Financial Services in Kenya; What is Working and Why? Paper presented at the Tegemo Institute of Agricultural Policy & Development, Nairobi, Kenya Accessed on the 11th December, 2014 www.ruralfinance.com at 11:28am.

Manza, E.A.G. (2014).Agricultural Cooperatives and Produce Marketing: The Challenge of Increasing Better Living Standards of the Farmers in Atyap land. Paper Presented at a Farmers Forum held at the AVM Ishaya Shekari Hall,Unguwar Wakili, Zangon Kataf, Friday,May 23,2014.

Manza, E.A.G. and Abdulsalam, Z. (2014). Food Security Status of Households in Promoting Sustainable Agriculture Project in Southern Borno state, Nigeria

Nigeria Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics (NIJADE). Volume 4 No.1 June, 2014. Pp. 43-58

Manza, E.A.G. and Makarau, S.B. (2015). Family Farming in Zangon Kataf Local Government Area: A case study of Atyap Chiefdom. Paper Presented at the Agricultural Society of Nigeria Conference, 2015 at the National Agricultural Extension and Liaison Service (NAERLS), Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. 12th – 15th May, 2015.

Matani, B.M. and Popoola, G. (2014). Analysis of Factors Influencing Small Scale Catfish Farming in Oyo Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria *Taraba Journal of Agricultural Research* (TAJAR). Vol.2 No.2 December, 2014. Pp.13-19.

Ocholi, A. (2011). A comparative Analysis of the Performance of Selected Rural Banks in Enhancing Agricultural Development in Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis submitted to the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State.

Ocholi, A. and Nyiatagher, Z.T. (2014). An Analysis of the Performance of Microfinance Banks in Agricultural Financing in Kogi State, Nigeria: 2010 – 2013 *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics*. Volume 4 No.1 June, 2014. Pp 110 – 121.

Olukosi, J.O. and Isintor, S.U. (1990). Introduction to Agricultural Marketing and Prices: Principles and Applications. Living Books Series, GU Publications, Abuja, FCT. Pp. 116

Okoh, R.N., Ugwumba, C.O.A. and Isitor, S.U. (2009). "Microfinance for Small Scale Enterprises Development in Anambra State, Nigeria; A gender Analysis." *Nigeria Journal of Research and Production* 15 (2). Pp. 145-159.

Spiegel, M.R. (1961). Theory and Problems of Statistics. Schaum's Outline Series. SI (Metric) Edition. McGraw Hill Book Company. Pp.201-216

Rapisura,A.(2008)."Tracking Financial Exclusion at the Grassroots". Paper Presented at the Central Bank of Nigeria(CBN) 2nd International Microfinance Conference and Annual Microfinance/Entrepreneurship Award, Abuja. January

Rapp, G. (1999). What are Cooperatives? Cooperative Information Report 10. U.S. Department of Agricultural Rural Business Cooperative Service, Washington, D.C. U.S.A. 24 Pp.

Robinson,M.S. (2002). "The Microfinance Revolution:Sustainable Finance for the Poor".Washington, D.C. World Bank Office of the Publisher. Pp.10-12.

Zubairu, E.A. and Maurice, D.C. (2014). Analysis of Household Food Insecurity Among Food Crop Farmers in Ardo-Kola Local Government Area of Taraba State, Nigeria *Taraba Journal of Agricultural Research* (TAJAR). Volume 2 No.2 December, 2014. Pp.20-25.