

# ASSESSMENT OF ADOPTION OF IMPROVED GINGER PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES IN KAJURU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

M. Ibrahim<sup>1</sup>, A. Abdullahi<sup>1</sup>, I.I. Yakubu<sup>1</sup> and K.M. Yisa<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Federal Soil Conservation PMB 2035 Kuru, Plateau State. Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

The study examines the adoption of improved ginger production technologies among farmers in Kajuru Local Government Area of Kaduna State. Multistage sampling was adopted. Kajuru LGA was purposively selected because of the preponderance of ginger production. In the second stage, a random selection of four extension blocks was made and eight extension cells were also randomly selected. Data were collected from 172 respondents through structured questionnaire and analysed using simple descriptive statistic. The result shows that the mean age of respondents was 32.5 years and majority (82.5%) were literates. Mean farming experience was 15 years. More than half (56.7%) of the respondents acquired their land through inheritance and majority (81%) got to know about improved ginger production technologies through radio. Improved production technologies such as use of herbicides ( $\bar{X}=3.4$ ), use of tarpaulins ( $\bar{X}=3.4$ ), use of jute bags ( $\bar{X}=3.4$ ) ranked highest among other production technologies adopted by the farmers. Constraints to adoption of improved ginger production technology were; lack of interest among youths ( $\bar{X}=2.6$ ) and high cost of hydro chemical ( $\bar{X}=2.5$ ). It was concluded that radio was the major source of awareness of ginger production technologies and use of chemical for land treatment ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in terms of adoption and farm size not adequate being major constraint. The use of radio programme should be strengthened for information dissemination. Land tenure regulations should be modified to allow farmers access to land. Chemical weed control should also be encouraged among ginger farmers.

**Keywords:** Ginger; extension block; adoption and technologies

## INTRODUCTION

Ginger (*Zingiberofficinale*Rosc.) is an herbaceous perennial plant belonging to the order (Scitamineae) and to the family (*Zingiberaceae*). It is a root crop and a typical herb extensively grown across the world for its pungent aromatic under-ground stem or rhizome which makes it an important export commodity in world trade (Ajibade & Dauda, 2005). Ginger's origin is not well established though it is generally thought to be a native of Asia, where it was first cultivated. It was also cultivated in the tropical regions of America. The plant is now cultivated in different parts of Nigeria, though the major producing areas include Kaduna, Nassarawa, Sokoto, Zamfara, AkwaIbom, Oyo, Abia and Lagos states although southern Kaduna still remain the largest

producers of fresh ginger in Nigeria, especially in Kachia, Jabba, Jama'a and Kagarko Local Government Areas (KADP, 2000, KADP, 2004; Bernard, 2008). The varieties produced in Nigeria are '*Taffin Giwa*' and '*Yatsun Biri*' which is higher in monoterpene and oil, giving a more pungent aroma and pungency. Therefore, it is usually preferred for the production of oils and oleoresins (KADP, 2000; ITC, 2007, Chukwu & Emehuite, 2003).

Nigeria ranked first in terms of the percentage of total hectares of ginger under cultivation but her contribution to total world output is too low compared to other countries. This could be attributed to the fact that most of production is undertaken by smallholder and traditional farmers with rudimentary production techniques and low yields. In addition, the smallholder farmers are constrained by many problems like lack of considering the farming of the crop as a business enterprise, therefore are not adequately focused on profit maximizing motive. This entails a little change of the economic behaviour of the farmer, his social relationships and local knowledge with little commercialization. Therefore, improving ginger production by farmers from subsistence to commercial production is long overdue as these resource poor farmers are faced with production and post-production challenges ranging from non-use of improved varieties, manual land preparation, inadequate inputs, local processing techniques, inadequate credit/capital, which often results in low production/ha and poor ginger quality.

Based on the aforementioned problems, this study is designed to identify the sources of information of adopting improved ginger production technology; determine the level of adoption of improved ginger production technology; and ascertain the major constraints faced by respondents in adopting improved ginger production technologies in the study area.

## **MATERIALS AND METHOD**

### **Study Area**

The study was conducted in Kaduna state, Nigeria. The state was created on 27<sup>th</sup> May, 1967. The capital of the state is Kaduna which is located between Longitude 7.750°E and Latitude 10.333°N. Kaduna State has projected population of about 8,497,769.17 (NBS, 2019). The vegetation cover is Northern type, characterized by scattered short trees, shrubs and grasses. The soil is mostly loamy to sandy type. A Substantial amount of clay is found also. There are two main climate seasons in the area; the dry and wet season with relatively high humidity. The dry season lasts from November to March while the wet season starts from April and ends in October. The average annual temperature in Kaduna state is 25.2°C. About 1211mm of precipitation falls annually.

### **Sampling Technique and Instrumentation**

Sample size of the study was arrived at using a multistage sampling technique. In the first stage, Kajuru LGA was purposively selected because of the preponderance of ginger production. The second stage involved a random selection of 4 extension block. The third stage involve random selection of 8 extension cells and the fifth stage involves random selection of 172 respondents from extension sub cell proportionate to the population in each community as adopted by Ibrahim (2016).

The primary data for this study were generated through questionnaire using interview schedule questionnaire administration method to provide information on the socio-economic

characteristics of ginger farmer, various technologies and levels of the adoption of improved ginger production technologies, source of information and the major constraints to adoption of improved ginger production technologies by the respondents in the study area.

## Data Analysis

The data collected from the respondents were analysed using descriptive statistics. Adoption Scale Analysis is a scale where mean is used to adjudge level of adoption of a particular technology. Three-point Likert scale rating of Very serious (3), serious (2), and not serious (1) values were used to rate the severity of the constraints.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

The mean age of the respondents was 32 years indicating active age. This agrees with the findings of Zugu *et al.* (2005) who reported that mean age of 30 years has positive correlation with agricultural activities. Majority 90.8% of the respondents were male implying that ginger production is male dominated. Majority 92.5% of the respondents were married this may probably be because of labour associated with ginger production. This agreed with the findings of Onyemauwa (2012) who reported that 57% of their respondents were married in the study area and thus participated very well in agricultural production. Majority 65.0% of the respondents had agriculture as their major occupation. This implies that farming is the main source of their livelihood. Only 47.5% of the respondents had farming experience between 11-20 years in the study area. This implies that the respondents have been involved in farming activities for long period of time. The longer the farming experience the better a farmer would be able to solve problems attributed to farming related activities. This negates the report of Padel (2001) who stressed that, farmers who have been long in the farming activities are usually older, less educated and more resistant to change than young entrants. Majority 56.7% of the respondents acquired their land through inheritance. This indicates that half of the respondents were indigene, which may be attributed to the importance attached to land. Majority 64.2% of the respondents had household size between 6 – 10 persons. This agrees with Idiong (2005) who reported that a relatively large household size has been shown to enhance the availability of labour force

Table 1: Socio Economic characteristic of respondents (sample size = 172)

| Variables      | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | SD   |
|----------------|-----------|------------|------|------|
| Age (years)    |           |            |      |      |
| 1-20           | 7         | 5.8        |      |      |
| 21-30          | 51        | 42.5       |      |      |
| 31-40          | 43        | 35.8       |      |      |
| 41-50          | 19        | 15.8       |      |      |
| Mean           |           |            | 32.5 | 0.31 |
| Gender         |           |            |      |      |
| Male           | 109       | 90.8       |      |      |
| Female         | 11        | 9.2        |      |      |
| Marital Status |           |            |      |      |

|                          |     |      |         |      |
|--------------------------|-----|------|---------|------|
| Single                   | 9   | 7.5  |         |      |
| Married                  | 111 | 92.5 |         |      |
| Educational Level        |     |      |         |      |
| Primary                  | 45  | 37.5 |         |      |
| Secondary                | 47  | 39.2 |         |      |
| Tertiary                 | 7   | 5.8  |         |      |
| Adult                    | 11  | 9.2  |         |      |
| Non-Formal               | 10  | 8.3  |         |      |
| Major Occupation         |     |      |         |      |
| Farming                  | 78  | 65.0 |         |      |
| Trading                  | 22  | 18.3 |         |      |
| Civil Servant            | 20  | 16.7 |         |      |
| Farming Experience       |     |      |         |      |
| 1-10                     | 7   | 5.8  |         |      |
| 11-20                    | 57  | 47.5 |         |      |
| 21-30                    | 56  | 46.7 |         |      |
| Mean                     |     |      | 15years | 0.23 |
| Mode of Land Acquisition |     |      |         |      |
| Gift                     | 11  | 9.2  |         |      |
| Inheritance              | 68  | 56.7 |         |      |
| Purchase                 | 4   | 3.3  |         |      |
| Rented                   | 37  | 30.8 |         |      |
| Communal land            | 68  | 56.2 |         |      |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2019

### Source of Information on Improved Ginger production Technologies

Majority (81.7%) of the respondents received information on ginger production from radio stations and 79.2% obtained information from ADP this means that radio is the most readily available source of agricultural information by the respondents. This finding is in line with Agbamu (2006) who stated that in adoption of improved varieties, farmers are most likely to be influenced by such information sources like agricultural cooperatives, radio, and friends and neighbours

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their sources of information on improved ginger production technologies (n=172)

| Items           | Frequency* | Percentage |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Extension agent | 83         | 69.2       |
| Mass media      | 59         | 49.2       |
| Radio           | 98         | 81.7       |
| ADP             | 95         | 79.2       |

Source: Field Survey 2019; Multiple response \*

### Level of Adoption of Improved Ginger Production Technologies

Improved production technologies such as use of herbicides ( $\bar{X}$ =3.4), use of tarpaulins ( $\bar{X}$ =3.4), use of jute bags ( $\bar{X}$ =3.4) ranked highest among other production technologies adopted by

the farmers. This means that chemical methods of weeding are gradually taking the centre stage of weed control methods. Planting with 25cm×45cm between rows and 15 cm × 20 cm within rows ( $\bar{X}$ =3.3). This means that plant population has role to play in total output of ginger farmers. Application of a total of 600kg/ha (12 bags) of NPK 15-15-15 bags at 3 weeks after sprouting and 7 bags at 3 months after planting ( $\bar{X}$ =3.3). This means that fertilization is one of the key variable costs that lead to increase in output of farmers in the study area and hand weeding ( $\bar{X}$ =3.3) Ranked 4<sup>th</sup>.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to adoption scale analysis

| Production technologies   | I  | E  | T   | A   | WS  | WM  | Decision  | Rank             |
|---|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|------------------|
| Use of bags (20kg or 25kg)  | -  | 16 | 171 | 220 | 407 | 3.4 | Adopt     | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| Use of mats or tarpaulins   | -  | 16 | 174 | 216 | 406 | 3.4 | Adopt     | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| Using of chemicals (herbicides)   | -  | 18 | 171 | 216 | 405 | 3.4 | Adopt     | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| Hand weeding  | -  | 24 | 174 | 200 | 398 | 3.3 | Adopt     | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Planting with 25cm×45cm between rows and 15cm×20cm within rows  | 1  | 10 | 210 | 176 | 397 | 3.3 | Adopt     | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Apply a total of 600kg/ha (12 bags) of NPK 15-15-15 bags at 3 weeks after sprouting and 7 bags at 3 months after planting | 2  | 12 | 204 | 176 | 394 | 3.3 | Adopt     | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Ploughing and harrowing use of tractor  | -  | 40 | 168 | 176 | 384 | 3.2 | Adopt     | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Practice shallow weeding  | -  | 50 | 177 | 144 | 371 | 3.1 | Adopt     | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
|   |    |    |     |     |     |     |           |                  |
| Use of fungicides   | 12 | 22 | 159 | 176 | 369 | 3.1 | Adopt     | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Use of trichoderma  | 5  | 36 | 159 | 176 | 376 | 3.1 | Adopt     | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Use of harvesting machine   | 10 | 26 | 159 | 176 | 371 | 3.1 | Adopt     | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Shake off soil, roots and wash rhizomes   | 5  | 36 | 162 | 172 | 375 | 3.1 | Adopt     | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Drilling seeds is placed 4 to 8cm   | 53 | 68 | 51  | 64  | 236 | 2.0 | Not Adopt | 13 <sup>th</sup> |

Source: Field survey 2018; I=Interest, E=Evaluation, T=Trial; A=adopt; WS=Weighted Sum; WM= Weighted Mean; \*Values in parentheses are percentages.

### Constraints to the Adoption of Improved Ginger Production Technologies

The variables in Table 4 with equal mean were ranked same. The following constraints were perceived as serious; lack of interest among youths ( $\bar{X}$ =2.6), This may probably be because of drudgery associated with farming activities, cost of hydro chemical ( $\bar{X}$ =2.5), This may be because rural farmers are resource poor and cannot afford to buy the required number of chemicals to treat their farm land, drought factor ( $\bar{X}$ =2.0), this might be a problem because farmers may likely not having readily irrigation facilities to augment the short rainfall.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to their Major Constraints to Adoption of Improved ginger production technologies

| Constraints                                    | Very serious | Serious  | Not Serious | WS  | WM  | Decision | Rank             |
|--|--------------|----------|-------------|-----|-----|----------|------------------|
| Lack of interest among youths                  | 77(64.2)     | 33(27.5) | 10(8.3)     | 307 | 2.6 | VS       | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| High cost of hydro-chemical                    | 66(55.0)     | 45(37.5) | 9(7.5)      | 297 | 2.5 | VS       | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| Lack of adequate knowledge of improve practice | 61(50.8)     | 45(37.5) | 14(11.7)    | 287 | 2.4 | VS       | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| Inadequate finance                             | 60(50.0)     | 39(32.5) | 21(17.5)    | 279 | 2.3 | VS       | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| High cost of labour                            | 65(54.2)     | 29(24.2) | 26(21.7)    | 279 | 2.3 | VS       | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| High cost of fertilizer                        | 62(51.7)     | 35(29.2) | 23(19.2)    | 279 | 2.3 | VS       | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Poor government support                        | 54(45.0)     | 32(26.7) | 34(28.3)    | 260 | 2.2 | VS       | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Low level of knowledge and awareness           | 48(40.0)     | 44(36.7) | 28(23.3)    | 260 | 2.2 | VS       | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Insufficient land for cultivation              | 52(43.3)     | 36(30.0) | 32(26.7)    | 260 | 2.2 | VS       | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Poor attitude of the farmer                    | 46(38.3)     | 47(39.2) | 27(22.5)    | 259 | 2.2 | VS       | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Lack of farming experience                     | 44(36.7)     | 46(38.3) | 30(25.0)    | 254 | 2.1 | VS       | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| Lack of storage facilities                     | 43(35.8)     | 46(38.3) | 31(25.8)    | 252 | 2.1 | VS       | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| Inefficient extension service delivery         | 36(30.0)     | 52(43.3) | 32(26.7)    | 244 | 2.0 | VS       | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| Poor transportation                            | 40(33.3)     | 40(33.3) | 40(33.3)    | 240 | 2.0 | VS       | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| Poor marketing of product                      | 41(34.2)     | 36(30.0) | 43(35.8)    | 238 | 2.0 | VS       | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| Drought factor                                 | 46(38.3)     | 25(20.8) | 49(40.8)    | 237 | 2.0 | VS       | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| Old age of the farmer                          | 29(24.2)     | 46(30.0) | 45(37.5)    | 224 | 1.9 | NS       | 17 <sup>th</sup> |
| High cost of farm tools                        | 25(20.8)     | 53(44.2) | 42(35.0)    | 223 | 1.9 | NS       | 17 <sup>th</sup> |
| Religion and tradition                         | 23(19.2)     | 53(44.2) | 44(36.7)    | 219 | 1.8 | NS       | 19 <sup>th</sup> |
| Low level of education                         | 29(24.2)     | 36(30.0) | 55(45.8)    | 214 | 1.8 | NS       | 19 <sup>th</sup> |
| Tedious of the technology                      | 26(21.7)     | 40(33.3) | 54(45.0)    | 212 | 1.8 | NS       | 19 <sup>th</sup> |
| Short life cycle of production                 | 11(9.2)      | 39(32.5) | 70(58.3)    | 181 | 1.5 | NS       | 22 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Scarcity of improved seed                      | 3(2.5)       | 55(45.8) | 62(51.7)    | 181 | 1.5 | NS       | 22 <sup>nd</sup> |
| Weak market information                        | -            | 56(46.7) | 64(53.3)    | 176 | 1.5 | NS       | 22 <sup>nd</sup> |
| Inadequate irrigation                          | -            | 43(35.8) | 77(64.2)    | 163 | 1.4 | NS       | 25 <sup>th</sup> |
| Poor soil fertility                            | -            | 53(44.2) | 67(55.8)    | 173 | 1.4 | NS       | 25 <sup>th</sup> |
| Smallness farm size                            | -            | 39(32.5) | 81(67.5)    | 159 | 1.3 | NS       | 27 <sup>th</sup> |

Source: Field Survey, 2019; WS = Weighted sum; WM= Weighted Mean; NS=Not Serious; S= Serious; VS= Very Serious; \*Values in parentheses are percentages

## CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the radio was the major source of awareness of ginger production technologies and use of chemical for land treatment rank 1<sup>st</sup> in terms of adoption and farm size not adequate being major constraint. It was recommended that; the use of radio programme be strengthened for information dissemination; chemical method of weed control should be encouraged by the ginger farmers to reduce drudgery associated with farming of ginger production; and problem of land tenure should be looked into so that the ginger farmer can get access to land

## REFERENCES

- Agbamu, J.U., Fujita, Y., Idowu, I.A., Lawal, A.O. (1996). Effects of Socio-Economic Factors on Adoption of New Varieties of Maize and Cassava: A Case Study of Ogun State in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Development Studies*, Volume 6(2), 8-16.
- Agbamu, J.U. (2006). *Essential of Agricultural Communication in Nigeria*, Malthouse Press Limited, Lagos, Nigeria, pp 187.
- Agbamu, J.U. and Urhorhoro, W.C. (2007). Adoption of Agricultural Management Technologies in Delta State. *Journal of Agricultural Society of Nigeria (ASN)*, 38:10-15
- Agwu, A. E. (2002). Cowpea Varietal Needs of Farmers in Bauchi and Gombe States of Nigeria. *Tropical Agric. Food, Environ. Ext.*, 3 (1): 55- 62.
- Ajibade, L., KandDauda, Y. (2005). *Ginger Plant; Ginger Extension Pamphlet*. Bennard Ginger Company, Kafanchan, Nigeria. pp 145
- Bernard, A. (2008). Diseases, pest and other factors limiting ginger (*Zingiberofficinale Rose*) production in River State. Being the text of a paper delivered during the Agricultural Product Development Strategy Workshop organized by Uptonville Foundation under the aegis of Rivers State Sustainable Development Agency (RSSDA). Retrieved from <http://uptonvilleoginstu.org/ginger.litm>. pp13
- Chukwu G.O., & Emehuite J.K. (2003). *Fertilizer efficiency and productivity of ginger on a hapilyariscol* in southern Nigeria. In M. O. Akoroda (editor) Root crops: the small processor and development of local food industries for market economy. Ibadan Polytechnic venture, Ibadan, Nigeria. pp198
- Emmanuel, L. (2008). Technology and Ginger Farm Performance. Path of Production Efficiencies Overtime, *Agriculture Economics Journal*, 2, 297-306.
- Ibrahim, M. (2016). Linkage practice among Agricultural Research Institutes Universities for Agriculture Innovation Transfer in North-Center Nigeria. Unpublished PhD Thesis submitted to the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. Pg. 60.
- KADP (Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project) (2000). Production of ginger: an extension guide. Kaduna State Agriculture Development Project, Kaduna. pp18
- KADP (Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project) (2004). Annual report. Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project, Kaduna. pp124
- Mbanaso, E.O. (2010). Adoption and disadoption of sweet potato production and processing technologies by farmers in South-eastern Nigeria. Ph.D. Research findings submitted to Department of Agricultural Extension University of Nigeria Nsukka. pp1-46.
- National Bureau of Statistic, (NBS) (2019). Annual report pp7

- Padel, S. (2001). Conservation to organic farming: a typical example of the diffusion of an innovation. *Sociological Ruralis*, 41(1), 40-61.
- Rogers, E.M. and Scott, K.H. (1997): The Diffusion of Innovations Model and Outreach from the National Network of Libraries of Medicine to Native American Communities. Draft paper prepared for the National Network of Libraries of Medicine, Pacific Northwest Region, and Seattle. Downloaded from <http://nmlm.gov/pnr/eve/rogers.html>
- Rogers, E.M. (1983). Diffusion of Innovators. (3rd ed). The Free Press N.Y. p. 77-92, 260- 261.