Vol. 17 (1) June, 2013 ISSN 1119-944X

http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jae.v17i1.15

Capacity Building Needs of Farmers for Safe Agro-chemical Use/Application in Niger State, Nigeria

Umar, S. I., Olaleye, R. S., Ndanitsa, M. A., Ibrahim, M., Tsado, J.H. and Sadiq, M.S.

Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Extension Technology, F. U.T., Minna umarsheshi@gmail.com 08039192721

#### Abstract

In order to determine the capacity building needs of farmers for safe agro-chemical use in Niger State, the study examined awareness of safety measures for agrochemical usage, sources of awareness, practice of safety measures and training needs of farmers. One hundred and twenty farmers were randomly selected from three local government areas in the state. Validated interview schedule with reliability coefficient of 0.89 was used to collect data. Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. All the respondents were aware of wearing of protective clothing and avoiding drinking/eating during spraying, safety measure such as avoiding off label use (7.50%) had low awareness level. The major sources of awareness were friend/relatives (55.00%). The most widely practised safety measure was avoiding ingesting or inhaling chemicals (91.67%), while the least practised safety measure was avoiding off label use (2.50%). Reasons given for not practicing some safety measures include heaviness of protective clothing (17.50%) and unreadable nature of instruction labels (14.17%). Major areas of training needs of the respondents were application (61.67%) and handling (52.50%) of agro-chemicals. A positive significant correlation existed between education (r = 0.461). farming experience (r = 0.337), farm income (r = 0.307) and practice of safety measures. It was therefore recommended that enlightenment campaign should be carried out in the State to raise awareness level for safe use of agro-chemicals in the agricultural transformation programme, while the characters of the instruction labels should be boldly written to facilitate reading and practice of safety measures.

#### Introduction

Agriculture is classified as one of the most hazardous sectors both in industrialized and developing countries with an estimated number of 170,000 agricultural workers being killed yearly (International Labor Organization ILO, 2004). This implies that agricultural workers are twice at risk of dying on the job when compared with workers in other sectors. For quit sometimes now there has been public concern about the crop protection and pest control chemicals, deliberately developed to be toxic to some living organisms which is the reason for their commercials utilization (Sajo and Mustapha, 2007). Accidental ingestion of agro-chemicals by humans and animals might produce adverse effect because they are very poisonous. Thus, there are a lot of health risks to the farmers and others handling and spraying agro-chemicals.

The negative human health and environment consequences arising from misuses of agro-chemicals is of great concern as farmers, farm workers and rural population experience both acute and chronic health effects from agro-chemical exposure. The

World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that globally, exposure to pesticide caused an annual 20,000 death and at least 3 million cases of poisoning are recorded annually with over 70% occurring in Africa (WHO, 2001). Other estimates suggest that annual figure for pesticide poisoning is as high as 20 million in developing countries alone (Jenyaratnam, 1990). Ajayi (2006) disputed these figures suggesting that those cases should be as much as even treble, since many cases are not reported in rural areas of developing countries. According to Sajo and Mustapha (2007) most human health and environment hazards are caused by mishandling of agrochemicals from their purchases, storage, application and disposal of pesticide waste and containers. The author further stressed that hazards can be minimized if stakeholders abide by the guideline on safe use of agrochemicals

World Health Organization (2001) in agricultural census reported that most of the agro-chemical operators are hired farm workers that lack agricultural background and use employment in the agricultural sector as an entry level job. The report also reveals that language barrier also exists which can impede following safety information on labels. All of those may increase health safety hazard in the agricultural work place (ILO, 2004). Training workshop on safe use of agro-chemicals organized by Daimina Project (2004) recommended precautionary measures by farmers when applying the various agrochemicals such as wearing of nose shield to avoid inhalation, protective clothing, rubber gloves and boots, restraining from smoking, eating and drinking during chemical applications, covering of food and water to avoid contamination among others. This study is significant in that the identification of capacity building needs of farmers for safe agro-chemical use and application will inform decision makers and instruct policy to reduce the negative effect of agro-chemicals in the agricultural transformation programme.

# Objectives of the study

The broad objective of the study is to examine the capacity building needs of farmers for safe agro-chemical use in Niger State; the specific objectives are to:

- 1 determine the awareness of safety measures of agrochemicals use;
- determine sources of awareness of safety measures;
- 3 determine the extent of practice of safety measures, and
- 4 identify areas of training needs of the respondents.

### Hypothesis of the study

There is no correlation between the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and practice of safety measures of agro-chemicals.

#### Methodology

Niger State falls within latitudes 8°-10°N and longitudes 3°-8° East. The State is located in the Southern Guinea Savanna ecological zone of Nigeria. The climate of the state is characterized by distinct wet and dry seasons. Some of the rains fed crops produced are maize millet sorghum, yam, groundnut, rice, cowpea cassava and meion. Economic trops grown include, mango, oil palm shea butter frees, locust bears, grange and guava. Vegetable crops such as pepper tomatoes someth and

okra are grown during the dry season along the banks of state's major rivers through irrigation. Animals reared include cattle, goat, sheep, camel, donkey and poultry (Niger State Agricultural Development Project, 2002).

Three local government areas (Mokwa, Paikoro and Wushishi LGAs) one from each of the 3 agricultural zones in the state were randomly selected for the study. A total of 12 villages were randomly selected from the LGAs. Based on the population of farmers in each of the selected village, a total of 120 respondents were sampled for the study from established sampling frame of 1,200 farmers. A validated interview schedule which was subjected to Cronbach's Alpha reliability test (r= 0.89) was used for data collection. Data were collected on the farmer's socio-economic characteristics and awareness of safety measures as well as on the practices of the safety measures and training needs. Age, educational level and farming experience were measured in years; while income, farm size and marital status were measured in naira, hectare and dummy respectively. Awareness, sources of awareness and areas of training needs were measured by asking the respondents to indicate the awareness of any safety measure, their sources of awareness and areas of training needs. Extent of practice of safety measures was measured by asking the respondents to indicate the number of safety measures they practised regularly. The maximum score for extent of practice of safety measures was 16 while the minimum score was 1 Field survey for data collection was conducted between January and March, 2012. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) and correlation analysis.

# Results and Discussion Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Result in Table 1 indicates that 12.50% of the respondents were less than 20 years, while 31.70% and 30.00% of the respondents were in the ranges of 20-29 years and 30-39 years, respectively. These findings suggest that majority of the respondents were in their active age ranges of 20-39 years and Hamidu *et al.* (2006) reported that young active farmers are more willing to adopt and practice new agricultural technologies than the older farmers. Table 1 further reveals that majority (94.20%) of the respondents were married. Findings on educational status of the respondents shows that (54.20% did not acquire formal education, while only (9.20%) have tertiary education. This result reveals that more than half of the respondents did not acquire formal education.

Majority (62.50%) of the respondents had more than 15 years of farming experience, which implies that the majority of the respondents have long years of experience. Most of the respondents (68.30%) realized income of between N151, 000 - N 250.000 Only 27.50% of the respondents realized above N250, 000 as farm income Similarly. Table 1 shows that (35.00%) of the respondents cultivated less than 1 hectare, while (45.80%) cultivated between 1-2 hectares. The mean farm size of the respondents was 1.3 hectare.

Table 1 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Action to the second se	the respondents	
/ariables	Frequency	Percentage
Age	17525 AV	10.50
>20years	15	12.50
20-29years	38	31.70
30-39 years	36	30.00
40-49years	15	12.50
50-59	10	8.30
60 and above	6	5.00
Total	120	100.00
Marital status		100004000
Single	7	5.80
Married	113	94.20
Total	120	100.00
Education		
No formal education	65	54.20
Primary education	24	20.00
Secondary education	20	16.60
Tertiary education	11	9.2
Total	120	100.00
Farming experience		
>5years	6	5.00
6-10years	19	15.80
11-15years	20	16.70
Above 15years	75	62 50
Total	120	100.00
Farm Income		
N50,000- N100,000	2	1.70
N101,000- N150,000	3	2.50
N151,000- N 200,000	45	37.50
N201,000- N250,000	37	30.80
Above N250 000	33	27.50
Total	120	100.00
Farm size		
>1ha	42	35.00
1.1ha.2ha	55	45.80
2 1ha-3ha	23	19.20
Total	120	100.00

Source Field survey, 2012

#### Awareness of safety measures

Data in Table 2 show that hundred percent each of the respondents were aware of wearing protective clothing wearing of rubber gloves/boots and avoiding drinking, eating or smoking during spraying, respectively. Similarly, 92.50% of the respondent were aware of wearing of nose shield to prevent inhalation, while 91.67% of the respondents knew about avoiding ingesting or inhaling of chemicals. Others included no spraying of chemical during windy periods (81.67%), covering of fond and water

ring spraying to avoid contamination (73.33%), avoiding skin contact with chemical 1.56%) no pouring of unused chemicals into drinking, irrigation or running water 4.17%), reading of instruction on label before using (45.83%), puncturing and irrying of used agro-chemical containers in the soil (35.00%), bathing with soap and ater after spraying chemical (30.00%), keeping of chemical under lock and key vay from children (21.67%), washing of spraying cloth separately from other cloths 5.83%), buying of chemical from a reputable sources (13.33%) and avoiding off bel use (7.50%). The findings reveal that there is low level of awareness on the last jur safety measures listed above in the state. Thus, the extension agents should ake special cognizance of those safety measures for appropriate information issemination to farmers.

Table 2
Awareness of safety measure by the respondents

Awareness of safety measure by the res	spondents	Percentage
wareness of safety measure*	riequency	and the second s
wareness of safety medical	16	13.33
lying of chemical from reputable sources	55	45.83
eading of instruction on label before using	98	81.67
not spray during windy period	120	100.00
learing of protective clothing.	111	92.50
earing of nose shield to avoid inhalation	120	100.00
learing of rubber gloves and boots	120	100.00
o not drink, eat or smoke while spraying	74	61.66
void skin contact with chemicals	110	91.67
o not ingest or inhale chemicals overing of food and water during spraying to avoid	1500000	73.33
ontamination to not pour unused chemical in to drinking, irrigation or		54.17
	42	35.00
unifing water Puncture used chemical containers and bury in the soil	9	7.50
and off labeliase	36	30.00
Both with soap and water after spraying chemicals	19	15.83
Wash spraying cloths separately from other cloths  Keep chemicals under lock and key away from children	26	21.67

Source Field survey, 2012

# Sources of awareness

Majority (55.00%) of the respondents got information on safety measures from friends and relatives through conversation. This was followed by cooperative societies (35.00%) and radio jingles (25.00%), while extension agents (20.83%) ranked fourth as a source of information on safety measures. The implication of the findings is that the majority of respondents had more interaction with non professionals (friends and relatives) than the extension agents who are supposed to be a reliable and better source of awareness on safety measures.

Multiple responses

Table 3 ribution of respondents according to their sources of awareness of safety

	measu	ires.	
rces of awareness of	safety	Frequency	Percentage
sure*		25	20.83
nsion agents		18	15.00
vision		30	25.00
io jinglės		66	55.00
nds/relatives		8	6.67
ters		42	35.00
perative societies ension bulletins		11	9.17
		7	5.83
vspaper/magazines		5	4.17
ghbours ruction labels on containers		2	1.67

urce Field survey, 2012 ultiple responses

# actice of safety measures

ble 4 shows practice of safety measures by the respondents. Only one quarter of respondents (25.83%) read instructions on the label before using the chemicals. 50, only 23.33% avoided pouring of unused chemicals into drinking, irrigation or nning water. It is pertinent to note that the practice of wearing rubber gloves/boot, otective cloth and nose shield had low responses with 22.50%, 18.33% and 83% response rate, respectively. Other safety measures that were not well actised included keeping of chemicals under lock and key away from the children 0.83%), puncturing and burying of used agro-chemical containers in the soil 50%), washing of spraying cloth separately from other cloths (6.67%) and roiding off label use (2.50%). This could be attributed to the low level of awareness and knowledge of the respondents on the devastating effect of the agro-chemicals, his poses a possible threat to farming families, animals, food and agriculture in the late.

Table 4
Practice of safety measures by the respondents.

Practice of safety measures by the respon	Frequency	Percentage
actice of safety measure*	6	5.00
ying of chemical from reputable source	31	25.83
ading of instruction on label before using	94	78.33
oiding spray during windy period earing of protective clothing	22	18.33
earing of nose shield to avoid inhalation	19	15.83
	27	22.50
earing of rubber gloves and boots oiding drinking leating or smoking while spraying	103	85 83
olding drinking leating of smoking white spraying	65	54,17
roiding ingestion or inhaling chemicals	110	91.67
overing of food and water during spraying to avoid	76	63 33
intamination voiding pouring unused chemical in to drinking, irrigation or		23 33
inning water uncture used agro-chemical containers and bury in the siol	9	7.50
uncture used agro-chemical containers and odry in the ore-	9 3	2.50
voiding off- label use	34	28.33
athing with soap and water after spraying	8	6.67
Vashing of spraying cloth separately from other cloths seep chemicals under lock and key away from children	13	10.83

Source Field survey, 2012

# Reasons for not practising safety measures

When asked to give reasons for not practicing some safety measures, 8.33% of the respondents in Table 5 indicated that they did not know the reputable dealers of the agro-chemicals in their area, while 17.50% of respondents indicated that they are not practicing wearing of protective cloth and rubber glove/ boots because they are too heavy to wear. On the other hand, some of the respondents (14.17%) reported that they are not practicing reading of instructions before using agro-chemicals because character of some instruction labels are too small or tiny to read. Other respondents constituting 15.00% indicated that they did not take some safety measure such as avoiding skin contact with chemicals, washing spraying cloth separately from other cloths and keeping chemicals under lock and key away from children very serious. This point to the problem of information provided by non-professionals (friends and relatives) This implies that a considerable awareness campaign is needed to promote the practice of some safety measures

Multiple responses

# Table 5 Reasons for not practicing safety measures

Reasons for not practice safety measures*	Frequency	Percentage
Did not know the reputable dealers	10	8.33
Protective cloths and rubber gloves/boots are	21	17.50
heavy to wear	17	14.17
Character of instruction labels too small to read Did not take safety measures very serious	18	15.00

Source Field survey 2012

### Training needs of farmers

Table 6 reveals that 61.7% of the respondents were in need of training on application of agro-chemicals on how to use knapsack sprayer, type of agro-chemical to apply under different environment, how to apply it and when it should be applied Similarly, 52.5% of the respondents were in need of training on handling of agro-chemicals such as mixing and cleaning of agro-chemical. Other areas of training needs were disposal of waste/containers (49.2%), storage (38.3%) and transportation (10.0%) of agro-chemicals. This result highlights the areas of capacity building needs of farmers, which suggest that most of the respondents were in need of training on application, handling and disposal of waste/container of agro-chemicals. Attending to those areas of needs will go a long way in building farmers' capacity for safe use and application of agro-chemicals, thereby minimizing pest resistance, damage to pollinating insects, phytotoxicity, agro-chemical drift, air pollution as well as hazards to human and wildlife species.

Table 6
Training needs of the respondents

Training needs*		Frequency
Percentage		V-2
Transportation of agro-chemicals	12	10.00
Storage of agro-chemicals	46	38.33
Handling of agro-chemicals	63	52.50
Application of agro-chemicals	74	61.67
Disposal of waste/containers of agro-chemicals	59	49.17

Source: Field survey, 2012

# Correlation between socio-economic characteristics and practice of safety measures.

Data in Table 7 shows a negative correlation between age and practice of safety measures. This implies that as farmers get older, they become more conservative and tend to abandon safety measures. In a related study, Hamidu et al. (2006) reported that old farmers often tend to be more conservative in relation to adoption of innovation and practices. However, educational level, farming experience and farm measure of the respondents had positive correlation with the practice of safety

<sup>\*</sup> Multiple responses

Multiple responses

measures, indicating that a unit increase in those variables will ensure constant practice of the safety measures by the respondents.

Table 7

Correlation between socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and practice of safety measures

the state of the s	r salety measures
Description of variables	Practice of safety measures
Age (years)	-0.290
Mantal status (dummy)	0.183 <sup>NS</sup>
Education ( years)	0.461
Farming experience (years)	0.337
Farm income (naira)	0.307
Farm size (hectare)	0.190 <sup>NS</sup>
Practice of safety measures (number)	1.00

Source Computed from field survey, 2012

r-values at 0 05=0.232

NS= Not significant

#### Conclusion

Most of the respondents were in need of training on application and handling of agrochemicals. Education, farming experience and farm income had positive correlation with practice of safety measures by the respondents.

#### Recommendations

Extension awareness campaign should be carried out in the state to raise the level of awareness on the safety measures of agro-chemicals and for farmers to take the safety measures very serious

List of reputable agro-chemical dealers in the state should be compiled by extension agent and made known to the farmers for patronage.

Lighter protective clothing and rubber boots should be designed by their manufacturers for farmers' conveniences, while the character of the instruction labels on the containers of agro-chemicals should be boldly written for ease of reading.

To build farmers' capacity for safe use and application of agro-chemicals in the state, extension education should pay particular attention to training the farmers on agro-chemical safety issues such as application, handling and disposal of waste/containers of agro-chemicals. This is necessary to prevent both human and animal health hazards as well as environmental hazards.

<sup>\*</sup>correlation is significant at 0.05 levels

#### ferences

- ayi A O (2006) A study on occupational safety practices among rural farmers in lie-life area of Osun State, Nigeria: An emphasis on relevant training needs; Department of Agricultural Research. *Journal of agricultural and biological* science 2(5), pp. 227-235.
- simina Project (2004) Safe use and handling of crop protection products. Training work jointly organized by USAID, IFDC, IITA, CANDEL, Union Bank, WARDA NCRI, SG 2000, RIFAN and FCT- ADP, held at Gwagwalada and Pandagi FCT
- amidu B.M., Murtala, N., Illiyasu, A.Y. and Adamu I.P. (2006) Assessment of the adoption of afforestation innovation in Dambatta Local Government Area, of Kano State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension* Vol. 9, pp.51-62.
- iternational Labaur Organization (2004). Safety and health in the use of agrochemicals pp.69
- eyaratnam. J (1990) Acute pesticide. A major problems world health statistics quarterly (43), pp. 139-144.
- liger State Agricultural Development Project (2002) Impact Study Final Report, pp 1-128
- Sajo. A A. and Mustapha A B (2007). Safety factors in effective weed management for sustainable environment. A symposium paper presented at the weed 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Conferences of the Weed Science Society of Nigeria, pp.11.
- World Health Organization (2001) Recommended classification of pesticides by hazard and guideline to classification 1998-1999,1999-2000and 2000-2001 WHO, Geneva, Switzerland.