

4.1.1 Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29
4.1.2 Household Size-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
4.2.3 Educational Qualifications-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
4.1.4 Farm Size	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
4.1.5 Farming Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33
4.1.6 Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34
4.2 Section 2									
4.2.1 Source of Credit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35
4.2.2 Distance from possible Source ofCredit-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
4.2.3 Size of Credit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
4.2.4 Uses of Credit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38
4.3 Conditions forAgricultural Credit lending	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
4.3.1 Categories of Agricultural Credit-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
4.3.2 Criteria for lending	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
4.3.3 Short-term Credit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
4.3.4 Medium-termCredit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4.4 Factors Affecting Demand for Credit and Repayment-									42
4.4.1 Factors that Affect Demand forCredit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
4.4.2 Factors that Affect CreditRepayment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44
Section3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
5.2 Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
5.3 Recommendations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55
References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57
Appendices	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

LIST OF TABLE

1. Table4.1 frequency distribution of respondents according to age.
2. Table4.2 .frequency distribution of respondents according to household size.
3. Table4.3 frequency distribution of respondents according to educationalqualification.
4. Table4.4 frequency distribution of respondents according to farm size.
5. Table4.5 frequency distribution of respondents according to farm experience.
6. Table4.6 frequency distribution of respondents according to income.
7. Table4.7 frequency distribution of respondents according to source of credit.
8. Table4.8 frequency distribution of respondents according to distance from source ofcredit.
9. Table4.9 frequency distribution of respondents according to size of credit.
10. Table 4.10 frequency distribution of respondents according tosource of credit.

11. Table 4.11 table showing interest paid by credit beneficiaries
12. Table 4.12 table showing time of disbursement.
13. Table 4.15 table showing regression result of the relationship between the output of cassava and independent variable of beneficiaries
14. Table 4.16 table showing regression result of the relationship between output of cassava and independent variable of nonbeneficiaries.
15. Table 4.17 table showing regression result of the relationship between the output of cassava and independent variable of both farmers.
16. Table 4.18 table showing Chow test of difference between beneficiaries and beneficiaries of credit.
17. Table 4.14 table showing output of cassava for credit beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries taken from average farm size of 3ha and 2ha, respectively.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Appendix 1: Questionnaire — — — — — 68
2. Appendix 2: Regression Result for Credit Beneficiaries and Non Beneficiaries. — — — — — 73

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In spite of the fact that oil still accounts for our major revenue (gearing toward 80 percent) and almost 100 percent of our export earnings (C.B.N, 2003), agriculture especially farming, forestry, livestock and fishing is shown to be the major activity of Nigerians (Chigbu, 2004). Regrettably, the trend performance has declined over the years. The sector growth remained at 5.8 percent between 1990-1993, falling to 3.5 percent between 1997-1998 and worse still declining to an abysmal 1.8 percent during the 1999-2001 periods (C.B.N, 2003). The agricultural sector is expected to have a growth rate of between 7 percent to 10 percent, in order to have any meaningful effect on poverty reduction (Ekpo, 2004).

This ugly situation is attributed to poor and less resources utilization, as a result of lack of financial supportive measures like loans, subsidies, grants, etc toward agriculture (Chigbu, 2004). The contribution of agriculture to the gross domestic product (G.D.P.) shows an average growth rate of 2.6 percent (C.B.N, 2003), a development not good enough for a sector employing about 70 percent to 80 percent of Nigerians. Food supply situation is not favorable equally; it has been reported by the food and agricultural organization (FAO, 1994), that there is an average food deficit of 1.2 percent, while the demand and supply of food stand at 3.7 percent and 5 percent respectively. This is why the World Bank (2003) data showed that more than 70 percent of Nigerians live below poverty line, a situation that can be reversed through agricultural development.

The World Bank's statement about Nigeria's poverty level has not gone down well for a

nation with abundant agricultural resources: different varieties of livestock and wildlife, an agricultural friendly climate, coastal and marine resources of over 960m shoreline and a large consumer market.

In Nigeria, agriculture is not practiced in a purposeful and enterprising manner. It is practiced more as a survival strategy, rather than as a business venture. This is attributed to low-income status of farmers, which makes them seldom able to accumulate capital goods required for purposeful and sustainable agriculture, causing their level of capacity utilization to be very low.

Availability of credit to farmers has been observed as one sureway of increasing agricultural output, through the improvement of efficiency and the expansion of production. Credit to farmers according to Olatumbode (1990) would assist in the following ways:

Procure new improved technology in agriculture, purchase high yielding and disease resistant crops, put more land into cultivation and organize the farm better and more purposeful.

Insufficient extension of production credit to farmers according to Meyer (1986), is the more critical factor responsible for the declining agricultural production. There is a big gap between the demand for and supply of credit to farmers for agricultural activities. Problems faced by farmers in raising money for agricultural production is colossal, because according to Chidebelu (1983), commercial and merchant banks are reluctant to give money for agricultural production. The reluctance is due largely to the fact that agriculture is biological in nature, hence prone to risk.

The establishment of several credit schemes in Nigeria is intended to solve the problem of lack of credit to the agricultural sector. Efforts to encourage farmers in Nigeria with credit and other agricultural incentives have only given individuals with political loyalty to the reigning government access to exploiting the ordinary farmers. Such incentives usually get to the false farmers who use it for other non-agricultural activities.

Repayment of credit by farmers is a pathetic story; there is a general tendency of farmers not to repay credit. F.A.O (1994) asserted that the inability of small-scale farmers in developing countries to repay credit could be traced to imperfection of the delivery system, a host of institutional factors and to the farmers themselves. Some of these factors include: inadequate supervision and quality of supervisory staff, poor market outlets, poor management ability of the borrowers, poor selling prices, unsuitable disbursement procedures, wrong attitude of farmers towards credit (regarded as gift from government), natural disasters, etc. Problems of repayment also stifle further credit to farmers, since most agricultural credit recycles.

Small-scale farmers are supposedly potential beneficiaries of agricultural credit in Nigeria, but are hampered by their small peasant holdings found over wide remote areas which makes supervision by credit officers difficult (Eze, 1997). To reap the benefits of credit, information relating to sources of credit is required by farmers. Such information may include

names of lenders, location and types of existing credit. They also need information on the terms of credit such as interest rate, credit amount and mode of repayment.

Credit institutions are the major source through which small-scale farmers can gain access to formal credit (Klonner, 2003); but the farmers are constrained by high interest rate and collateral. This development has informed successive Nigeria governments to initiate programmes and policies that would ensure adequate transfer of cheap credit to small-scale farmers (Nweze, 2001). These programmes and policies have over the years given rise to.

- The Agriculture Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund (A.C.G.S.F) in April, 1978.
- The community Bank of Nigeria (C.B.N) in 1990
- The Family Economic Advancement Programme (F.E.A.P) 1997
- Nigeria Agricultural, Co-operative and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB), which is the most recent.

EFFECT OF CREDIT ACQUISITION AND REPAYMENT ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN CROSS RIVER STATE NIGERIA

The complete project material is available and ready for download. All what you need to do is to order for the complete material. The price for the material is NGN 3,000.00.

Make payment via bank transfer to Bank: Guaranteed Trust Bank, Account name: Emi-Aware technology, Account Number: 0424875728

Bank: Zenith Bank, Account name: Emi-Aware technology, Account Number: 1222004869

or visit the website and pay online. For more info: Visit <https://researchcub.info/payment-instruct.html>

After payment send your depositor's name, amount paid, project topic, email address or your phone number (in which instructions will sent to you to download the material) to +234 70 6329 8784 via text message/ whatsapp or Email address: info@allprojectmaterials.com.

Once payment is confirmed, the material will be sent to you immediately.

It takes 5min to 30min to confirm and send the material to you.

For more project topics and materials visit: <https://researchcub.info/> or For enquiries: info@allprojectmaterials.com or call/whatsapp: +234 70 6329 8784

Regards!!!