Democratic Governance and Food Security in Nigeria: A Study of Akwa Ibom State

Michael Effiong Ukpong[1], Ekom Kuyak Udofia[2]

Department of Public Administration University of Uyo, Uyo

ABSTRACT

The paper interrogated the impacts of democratic governance on food security in Nigeria using Akwa Ibom State as a case study. The identified problems of the research which the study set out to address were the adoption of modern farming methods; coupled with inefficient utilization of budgeted funds. Relevant literature was exhaustively reviewed and the Structural Functional Theory by Gabriel Almond, James Coleman and William Mitchell (1960 and 1968) as well as System Theory by David Easton (1953) were adopted as theoretical guide. Survey research design was used in the work, and this was contingent upon the fact that this approach enabled the researcher to collect detailed information which described the phenomena. The major instrument for data collection was likert scale structured questionnaire which was administered by the researcher. Three Hundred and two (302) copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the respondents, of which Two Hundred and Ninety-Five (295) were retrieved and used for data analysis. Research hypotheses were tested at 0.5 level of significance using Chi-square distribution (X^2). The result showed that there is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security, there is significant relationship between adoption of modern farming methods and food security and inefficient utilization of budgeted funds tends to affect food security. Based on the findings, recommendations were made, among which were: a more sustained process of democratization be put in place to create a friendly agricultural productivity environment to boost food security. Policy makers should include food as a component of welfarism and as such should develop political will to achieve increased food production, evolve sound food policies in order to attain food security. Budgetary provision for the agricultural sector should be augmented so that there will be enough fund to develop the sector. Also, there should be mechanisms to monitor funds appropriated for the sector.

Keywords: Democratic Governance, Food Security, Akwa Ibom State

INTRODUCTION

The process of democratic governance and consolidation is a complex one. It is a process in which all major political actors come to agree and diligently adhere to the democratic rules. Hence, every organization, institution and the citizenry must be part of the democratic process that will enhance the entrenchment of democratic cultures and practices. Indeed, democracy is a system of government that gives preference to and strengthens citizens' decision making and thereby promotes equal participation of localities in securing and building their nation for the collective good of all while upholding the principles of justice, peace and the rule of law (Kelson, 1955). According to Eigege and Cooke (2016) democracy means governance system in which leaders are selected through free and fair elections, with institutions that foster a shared distribution of power, and citizens have extensive opportunities to participate in political life. According to them, democracy requires a high degree of basic political freedom, civil liberties, political rights and strong institutions. That is, institutions that are free from executive or political interference that guide political action and inaction of both the ruling class and the ruled.

Democratic governance on the other hand implies the art of governing people in line with the tenets of democracy. This concept has been popularized as "good governance" by international financial institutions, the World Bank, and International Monetary Fund (IMF) by which they refer to the exercise of political power to promote the public good or the welfare of the people (Babawale, 2007).

In an attempt to ensure food security, boost food production and availability in the state, Akwa Ibom State Government under the leadership of Governor Udom Emmanuel has embarked on several agricultural based initiatives, such as, the establishment of rice processing mill at Ini Local Government Area, engaging in Garri production to bridge deficit witnessed as a result of external sourcing, empowering local farmers with improved seedlings as well as subsidizing the price of fertilizer. However, despite these efforts at ensuring food sufficiency in the state, the situation remains a mirage. One would have expected a government to provide and meet one of the basic needs of man which is food. But the reverse is the case, as most citizens cannot afford three square meals per day due to increase in prices of food and low purchasing power. It is against this background that the study will examine the challenges facing food security in a democratic dispensation in Nigeria with particular reference to Akwa Ibom State.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, food security is obtained when all people, at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Thus, for a country to be food secure, its citizens should be able to obtain adequate food needed at all times, and should be able to utilize the food to meet their bodily needs. Thus, a nation that its food production level is unable to satisfy the above criteria is said to be food insecure.

In Nigeria, food accounts for a large and increasing share of family budget for poor and urban families. If prices of staple foods soar, poor and vulnerable people bear the brunt. The Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), an agency of the United Nations, once raised alarm that Nigeria, Morocco and Bangladesh faced imminent food crisis. The report stated that the global food situation was in dire straits. Therefore, in a bid to solve the above stated problem, there have been great concerns over food sufficiency in many countries, including Nigeria. Many countries as a proactive measure have consistently and persistently sought strategies to ensure and boost food availability, accessibility and affordability for her citizens. However, taking a cursory look at Nigeria's present state where more than 80% of her population is living on less than $1 per day, it will not be misleading to say that Nigeria in view of the present reality is thousands of miles away from meeting her food demand and supply need in spite of the Buhari's led government policy thrust of boosting food production.   In Akwa Ibom State, various policies/programmes have been adopted to ensure food sufficiency. Some of these policies/programmes include: Integrated Farmers Scheme (IFS), Akwa Ibom Agricultural

Development project (AKADEP), Fertilizer Procurement and Development Project (FPDP), Agricultural Loan Credit Scheme, Agricultural Inputs Distribution (AGID), Community Plantation Development Scheme (CPDS) etc. Funds have also been committed to these programmes to ensure that their objectives are achieved, yet the food situation in the State does not get close to sufficiency. Everyday load of trucks from Cross Rivers, Benue and other States arrive Akwa Ibom State to supply those food items that the state can produces locally. What then has been the impact of democratic governance on food security in Akwa Ibom State? This is the crux of the problem.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study was to examine the impacts of democratic governance on food security in Akwa Ibom State. Specific objectives are

1. To examine the relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State.
2. To identify the impact of modern farming methods on food security in Akwa Ibom State.
3. To examine the relationship between inefficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Research Questions

To achieve the above objectives, the following questions guided the study.

i.   Does the adoption of democratic governance boost food security in Akwa Ibom State?

ii.   To what extent does adoption of modern farming methods enhance food security in Akwa Ibom State?

iii.   To what extent does inefficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture affect food security in Akwa Ibom?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses guided the study

i.   There is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

ii.   There is a significant relationship between the adoption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State

iii.   Ineffective utilization of budgeted fund for agriculture tends to affect food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Democracy

It is difficult to reach a consensus on the definition of democracy. However, the main ideal of democracy is widely accepted to have originated from Athens in the 5th Century BC. According to Lindell and Scott (1999), the term originated from the Greek word (demokratia) "rule of the people" which was coined from 'demos' "people" and "Krakos" "power or rule". The Webster New Dictionary (1995) defines democracy as a government in which supreme power is invested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through their representatives.

In a lecture titled "What is Democracy?" Diamond (2004) gave an overview of what in his opinion is democracy. He describes democracy as a system of government with four key elements.

(i)   A system for choosing and replacing the government through free and fair election

(ii)   Active participation of the people, as citizens, in politics and civic life

(iii)   Protection of the human rights of all citizens and

(iv)   A rule of law in which the laws and procedures apply equally to all citizens.

Javie (2006) sees democracy in contrast to dictatorship or tyranny. He places emphasis on the availability of opportunities for the people to control their leaders without recourse to a revolution. Poppers view must have hinged on the fact that there are many variants of democracy today. The most dominant variant is what he terms direct democracy in which all citizens of a country are given direct and active participation in the decisionmaking process of their countries. Another variant is the representative democracy in which all eligible citizens remain sovereign but political power is exercised indirectly through elected representatives.

In furtherance of this, Kelsen (1955) and Barak (2006), assert that representative democracy which allows freedom of political expression, freedom of speech and freedom of the press are considered to be the essential rights that allow eligible citizens to be adequately informed and to vote according to their own interests. From the foregoing, it can be stated that the basic feature of democracy according to Nassbaum (2000) is the capacity of all voters to participate freely and fully in the life of their society, and that democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens have an equal say in law-making (Diamond, 2006).

Governance

Governance has been variously defined. To Adetiba and Rahim (2012), governance can be seen as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. To them, governance has three dimensions; political, administrative and economic. Political governance is the process of decision making to formulate policies. It seeks to prevent and reduce intra and interstate conflict, implement constitutional democracy, which include free and fair election, the rule of law and human right. Administrative governance is the system of policy implementation, promoting accountability and efficiency of public office holders. Economic governance refers to the decision-making process that affect a country's economic activities and its relationship with other economies.

To Bliss (2002) governance includes not only the government but also the private sector and the civil society. United Nations Development Programmes (1997) contends that government is the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a nation's affairs, or the complex mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interest, exercise the legal rights and obligations and mediate their differences. It encompasses every institution in the society, from the family to the state and embraces all methods, bad or good, that society uses to distribute power and manage public resources and problems. This shows that governance differs from government, because government simply discusses the political, economic and administrative process carried out by the state, while governance embraces the interactive process between government, the private sector and civil societies.

Governance embodies the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good. Although, a synergy is usually assumed to exist between the state and micro governance sites which play complementary roles, the state as government remains the focus of governance discourse. In any case, it suffices to say that governance will only be diluted to meaninglessness if we forget alongside other complex ideas of state management and efficient service delivery. To this end, governance is very much like planning policies and ethics.

Democratic Governance

The crave for democratic governance and it relative general acceptance as revealed by its penetration into the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa shows that democracy has been generally accepted due to its perceived benefits to citizens and nations. In other words, democratic governance is positively disposed to poverty in terms of ensuring sound policies to boost food production due to its benefits to the people. It must be stated that some of the underlying principles of democratic governance are; freedom of expression and association, equity, responsibility, transparency, defense and rule of law (Vanhanem, 1990).

Thus, democratic governance is sometime seen as a yardstick for measuring good governance, and to a large extent, a good number of persons agree with this position. Democratic governance has inherent checks and balances principles that prevent any of the organs of government from becoming uncontrollable and overbearing on the system. The system also ensures improved quality of democratic institutions and process, and manages the changing roles of the state and civil society in an increasingly globalized world (UNDP, 2009). Moore (2004) observed that poor people have great potential electoral power. They often constitute the majority in less developed countries like Nigeria where poverty level is relatively high. However, this poor majority lacks the political and financial abilities and it is only organised by other social group based on the ideas and policy agenda set by others. However, in some countries of the world, good democratic governance has resulted in better life for the citizens due to the people-oriented policies and programmes that translate into food security. Samarasinghe (1994) was of the same opinion with this position when he noted that there was an improvement in social welfare in some countries as a result of democratic governance because the competition for votes of the people promotes welfare policies. Numerous examples abound in favour of the positive impact that democratic governance has had on the people and country at large.

Food Security

The concept of food security is a recent phenomenon which emerged nearly four and a half decades ago during the world food conference organized in 1974 by Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) of the United Nations. It was during this conference that world community for the first time tried to find out ways and means to provide food security to the hungry millions by producing enough food, assuring people of an uninterrupted food supply and providing safety from dramatic fluctuations in food prices (Anderson and Cook, 1999). The concept of food insecurity came into existence as a means of distinguishing the relationship between hunger, poverty and unemployment. The concept marked a paradigm shift, establishing hunger as bio-cultural phenomenon which combines an individual's physiological experience with structural constraints and household coping strategies (Cooper, 2013).

Some literature discusses food security as a phenomenon that existed even before the formation of the United Nations in 1945, when some human community began to unite in smaller groups to look into a pressing common problem affecting the very basic freedom of the people, that is, shortage of food. They envisioned rationalizing food production, supply and trade for the benefits of both producers and consumers, in both developing as well as developed countries (Shaw, 2007).

Empirical Review

Food security is a multifaceted phenomenon covering climate change, civil unrest, disaster and social norm along with food production; availability, accessibility, affordability and utilization, therefore, its determinants are at different levels of application, that is global, regional, national, household and individual levels. A number of studies have analyzed food security situation in Nigeria and globally.

According to Clement (2014) who studied the determinants of food insecurity among households in Ebonyi state; the study revealed that the incidence of food insecurity was high within the age bracket of 40-49 years (27.5%) but the severity and depth was higher within the age bracket of 50 years and above. The age bracket within 40-49 years fell under potential food insecurity group with less than 50% calorie deficiency, while those within the age bracket of 50 years and above fell within chronic food insecurity group with more than 50.0% calorie deficit. This agrees with the findings of FAO (2004) that about 4.7% of the population consumes less than their dietary requirements. This may be attributed to old age which makes them less active, less productive and unable to look for jobs, as such the severity is higher among this category. The incidence of food insecurity is also high among households in which the heads of the family had low level of education (30.8%), likewise, the depth and severity of food insecurity (0.3 and 0.29), with the incidence being less among households headed by highly educated persons. This agrees with the findings of Amaza (2006), which suggests that the higher the educational level of a head of household, the more the food security status of the family. The results also show that the incidence, depth, and severity were higher among families with large household size than among those with small household size. This is obvious because the larger the household size, the greater the responsibilities, especially in a situation where many of the household members do not generate any income but only depend on the household head. This is in consonance with the findings of Maharjan and Chhetri (2006) that food secure households have small size and low dependency ratio.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To give this work a scientific base, the researcher adopted Structural Functionalism and System Theory as theoretical framework. Structural functionalism was propounded by Gabriel Almond, James Coleman and William Mitchell in (1960 and 1968) respectively to explain the functions of each societal structure. The structural-functional approach emphasizes the role of structures and functions in understanding politics and political processes and the conditions under which structures can perform and the functions could be fulfilled.

The theory sees society as a structure with interrelated parts design to meet the biological and social needs of the individuals in that society. The theory sees society as a complex system whose parts work together to promote solidarity and stability (Marcionis 2010). This theory looks at society through a macro-level orientation. It attempts to explain why society functions the way it does by focusing on the relationship between the various social institutions and sectors that make up the society. The theory revolves around two concepts: structures and functions. According to Mertons, functions are defined as the objective consequences of patterns of actions for the systems in which they occur. That is, functions are those observed consequences which make for the adaptation or adjustment of a given system (Merton, 1949).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Area of the Study

Akwa Ibom State was created on September 23, 1987 with the promulgation of Decree No. 24 under the military regime of Gen. Ibrahim Babangida. The 2006 census figure put the population of Akwa Ibom at over 3.9 million people. The state has thirty-one (31) Local Government Areas according to the 1999 constitution of Nigeria as amended. Akwa Ibom State is bounded in the East by Cross River, in the West by Rivers and Abia States and in the South by the Atlantic Ocean and the southernmost tip of Cross River State. Akwa Ibom State lies entirely on the coastal plain of south eastern Nigeria where no part constitutes an area of appreciable high relief. The state is made up of three (3) major ethnic groups, namely, Ibibio, Annang and Oron

The state's agricultural endowment provides a representative context for analysing how democratic governance can boost food security.

Methods

The study adopted survey research design to enable the researcher elicits information from the sub-set of the population. Survey refers to a process of eliciting data from a target population through either the questionnaire or interview instrument, or subjecting such data to statistical analysis for the purpose of drawing conclusion (Obasi, 1999). The population of the study comprises all the staff in the Ministry of Agriculture, AKADEP and small-scale farmers selected from the 3 senatorial districts in the state. The population of the Ministry of Agriculture and AKADEP from their nominal roll stood at 812 and 487 respectively. This comprises senior and junior staff from all the departments. Small-scale farmers selected from the 3 senatorial districts were 150. This brought the total number to 1,449 and this constituted the population of the study. The sample size of 302 was selected using Krejcie and Morgan Table. The study adopted multi-stage sampling technique (stratified, simple random sampling and purposive) to select sample for the study. The population was stratified into Ministry of Agriculture, AKADEP and small-scale farmers. The small-scale farmers were selected from three (3) LGAs, each representing a senatorial district. The three (3) units of analysis were purposively selected by the researcher. This method was necessary because the researcher had to reach out to all the units/sections of the study area where the respondents will be engaged for the purpose of eliciting information from them. The main goal of purposive sampling was to focus on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest to the researcher or have certain characteristics relevant to the study. Also, stratified technique was adopted because there was the need to represent all groups in the target population in the sample.

Data were primarily collected through structured questionnaires, supplemented by secondary sources such as journals, textbooks, and newspapers and magazines. To ascertain the validity of the instrument, it was subjected to both face and content validity by the researcher through the valuable corrections that were effected research experts before they were taken to the field for administration. The face validity enabled the researcher to exercise his judgment based on the face value of the items on the questionnaire while content validity gave the supervisor and other experts the opportunity to ensure that the measuring tools (questionnaire) covered the full range of idea and variables that they were supposed to cover. A pilot survey involving twenty (20) copies of the questionnaire were administered to twenty respondents who were not part of the main study. The resulting data were subjected to Cronbach alpha reliability analysis and a reliability coefficient of 0.96 was obtained. The data obtained were analysed using tables and simple percentages. While the Chi-Square technique was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Table 4.1: **Percentage Analysis of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Sex:		
Male	188	63.72
Female	107	36.27
Total	**295**	**100**
Age:		
18-27	60	20.33
28-37	77	26.10
38-47	86	29.15
48 and above	72	24.46

Total	**295**	**100**
Occupation:		
Min of Agric	156	52.88
AKADEP	109	36.94
Farmer	30	10.16
Total	**295**	**100**
Edu. Qualification:		
FSLC	43	14.57
SSCE	46	15.59
OND/HND	73	24.74
BSc	106	35.93
MSc and above	27	9.15
Total	**295**	**100**
Marital Status:		
Single	120	40.67
Married	160	54.23
Divorced	15	5.08
Total	**295**	**100**
Average Income:		
Below 50,000	99	33.55
Below 100,000	130	44.06
Below 500,000	46	15.59
Above 500,000	20	6.77
Total	**295**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Interpretation of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4.1: Shows that 188 respondents representing 63.72% were males, while 107 respondents representing 36.27% were females. The table also shows the age distribution of the respondents in the following order: 18-27; 60 respondents representing 20.33%, 28-37; 77 respondents representing 26.10%, 38-47; 86 respondents representing 29.15%, 48 and above; 72 respondents representing 24.40%. Significantly, the table also revealed

the occupation of the respondents which shows that 156 respondents representing 52.88% were staff of ministry of Agriculture, 109 respondents representing 36.94% were staff of AKADEP while 30 respondents representing 10.16% were farmers.

The educational qualification distribution of the respondents showed that 43 respondents representing 14.57% had FSLC, 46 respondents representing 15.59% had SSCE, 73 respondents representing 24.74% had OND and HND, 106 respondents representing 35.93% had BSc, while 27 respondents representing 9.15% had MSc and above. Importantly, the table also revealed the marital status of the respondents which showed that 120 respondents representing 40.67% were single, 160 respondents representing 54.23% were married while 15 respondents representing 5.08% were divorced. In terms of average income, the table showed that 99 respondents representing 33.55% earned below 50,000; 130 respondents representing 44.06% earned below 100,000; 46 respondents representing 15.59% earned below 500,000 while an insignificant 20 respondents representing 6.77% earned above 500,000.

Table 4.2: **Responses on Democratic Governance**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total
1	Democratic governance is capable of addressing the problem of food security	123 41.69	100 33.89	50 16.94	22 7.45	295
2	Food availability is guaranteed in a democratic government	33 11.18	25 8.47	103 34.91	134 45.42	295
3	Democratic governance has positive effect on the attainment of food security	100 33.89	134 45.42	37 12.54	24 8.13	295
4	The practice of democratic governance in Akwa Ibom State has promoted food production	28 9.49	56 18.98	101 34.23	110 37.28	295
5	Bad governance is the cause of food scarcity	120 40.67	90 30.50	50 16.94	35 11.86	295

Key: SA = Strongly Agreed, A = Agreed, SD = Strongly Disagreed, D = Disagreed

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Interpretation of Responses on Democratic Governance and Food Security

Table 4.2 above revealed that 41.69% of the respondents strongly agreed; 33.89% agreed; 16.94% disagreed; while 7.45% of the respondents strongly disagreed that democratic governance is capable of addressing the problem of food security. Accordingly, for item two, 11:18% of the respondents strongly agreed,

8.47% agreed; 34.91% disagreed, while 45.42% strongly disagreed that food availability is guaranteed in a democratic government. The third item was interested in knowing if democratic governance has positive effect on the attainment of food security. For this item, 33.89% the respondents strongly agreed, 45.42% agreed, 12.54% disagreed, while 8.13% strongly disagreed. For item four, 9.49% of the respondents strongly agreed that the practice of democratic governance in Akwa Ibom State has promoted food production. However, 18.98% agreed, 34.23% disagreed, while 37.28% strongly disagreed. For the last item, 40.67% of the respondents strongly agreed that bad governance is the cause of food insecurity, 30.50% agreed, 16.94% of the respondents disagreed; while 11.86% of the respondents strongly disagreed.

Table 4.3: **Responses on the Adoption of Modern Farming Methods**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total
6	Modern farming methods are likely to improve food production	144 48.81	88 29.83	41 13.89	22 7.45	295

7	Farmers in Akwa Ibom State have been trained on application of fertilizer	92 31.18	124 42.03	45 15.25	34 11.52	295
8	There will be improved crop yield if farmers till their farm before planting	105 35.59	98 33.22	61 20.67	31 10.50	295
9	Training has been conducted for farmers to sharpen their skills	56 18.98	44 14.91	73 24.74	122 41.35	295
10	Most farmers in Akwa Ibom State do not know much about all season farming	141 47.79	82 27.79	46 15.59	26 8.81	295

Key: SA = Strongly Agreed, A = Agreed, SD = Strongly Disagreed, D = Disagreed

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Interpretation of Responses on the Adoption of Modern Farming Methods

The respondents view on the adoption of modern methods in boosting food security in Akwa Ibom State showed that 48.81% of the respondents strongly agreed; 29.83% agreed, 13.89% disagreed; while 7.45% strongly disagreed that modern farming methods are likely to improve food production. The analysis also showed that 31.18% of the respondents strongly agreed; 42.03% agreed; 15.25% disagreed; while 11.52% strongly disagreed that farmers in Akwa Ibom State have been trained on the application of fertilizer. Accordingly, in item eight, 35.59% of the respondents strongly agreed, that there will be improved crop yield if farmers till their farms before planting. To the option, 33.22% also agreed while 20.67% and 10.50% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The responses that training has been conducted for farmers before planting showed that 18.98% of the respondents strongly agreed; 14.91% agreed, 24.74% disagreed while 41.35% strongly disagreed, which implied that most of our respondents have not been trained on modern farming methods. Finally on the tenth variable, 47.79% of the respondents strongly agreed, 27.79% agreed, 15.59% disagreed, while 8.81% strongly disagreed that most farmers in Akwa Ibom State do not know much about all season farming.

Table 4.4: **Responses on Inefficient Utilization of Budgeted Funds**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total
11	Delay in the release of budgeted fund has contributed to failure of agricultural programmes	117 39.66	128 43,38	32 10.84	18 6.10	295
12	Most farmers that visit my office find it difficult to access funds to support their farming business	127 43.05	112 37.96	21 7.11	35 11.86	295
13	Only on few occasions has money meant for subject moved to another	18 6.10	23 7.79	150 50.84	104 35.25	295
14	We only execute project which funds are available	105 35.59	97 32.88	53 17.96	40 13.55	295
15	I have seen my colleagues use their personal money to do government work	28 9.49	30 10.16	77 26.10	160 54.23	295

Key: SA = Strongly Agreed, A = Agreed, SD = Strongly Disagreed, D = Disagreed

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Interpretation of Responses on Insufficient Utilization of Budgeted Funds

The responses to question eleven showed that 39.66% of the respondents strongly agreed, 43.38% agreed, 10.84% disagreed, while 6.10% strongly disagreed that delay in the release of budgeted fund has contributed to failure of agricultural programmes in Nigeria. Accordingly, 43.05% of the respondents strongly agreed, 37.96% agreed, 7.11% disagreed; while 11.86% strongly disagreed that most farmers that visit find it difficult to access funds to support their farming business. The responses further revealed that 6.10% strongly agreed, 7.79% agreed, 50.84% disagreed, while 35.25% strongly disagreed that only on few occasions has money meant for a subject moved to another. It was also observed that 35.95% strongly agreed, 32.88% agreed, 17.96% disagreed, while 13.55% of the respondents strongly disagreed that only projects of which funds are available are executed. Finally, the analysis on table 4.4 also revealed that 9.49% strongly agreed 10.16% agreed, 26.10% disagreed, while 54.23% strongly disagreed that the respondents use their personal money to do government work.

Table 4.5: **Responses on Food Security in Akwa Ibom State**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total
16	Ensuring food security is a function of good government policies	133 45.08	125 42.37	21 7.11	16 5.42	295
17	Most households in Akwa Ibom State are not food secure	81 27.45	107 36.27	63 21.35	44 14.91	295
18	The bulk of food consumed in Akwa Ibom State comes from other states	116 39.32	103 34.91	39 13.22	37 12.54	295
19	Bringing in food from other state is more profitable than engaging in farming in Akwa Ibom State	10 3.38	13 4.40	126 42.71	146 49.49	295
20	Food security would be attained in Akwa Ibom State if government store enough food in food reserve	115 38.98	94 31.86	57 19.32	29 9.83	295

Key: SA = Strongly Agreed, A = Agreed, SD = Strongly Disagreed, D = Disagreed

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Interpretation of Responses on Food Security

Table 4.5 revealed that 45.08% of the respondents strongly agreed that ensuring food security is a function of government policies. Also, for this item, 42.37% agreed, 7.11% disagreed; while 5.42 strongly disagreed. Accordingly, for item seventeen, 27.45% of the respondents strongly agreed that most households in Akwa Ibom State are not food secure. It was also observed that, 36.27% of the respondents agreed; while 21.35% and 14.91% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. For item eighteen, significantly, 39.32% of the respondents strongly agreed that, the bulk of food consumed in Akwa Ibom State comes from other states. Also, for this item, 34.91% agreed; 13.22% disagreed, while 12.54% strongly disagreed on this item. Furthermore, in item nineteen, 3.38% respondents strongly agreed that bringing in food from other states is more profitable than engaging in farming in Akwa Ibom State. More so, 4.40% agreed; 42.71% disagreed; while 49.49% strongly disagreed on this item. Finally, 38.98% of the respondents strongly agreed that food security would be attained in Akwa Ibom state if government stores enough food in food reserve; 31.86% agreed; 19.32% disagreed; while 9.83% strongly disagreed.

Testing of Hypotheses

For the purpose of testing the hypotheses, the chi-square (x^2) test is required. The chi-square test has a basic rule which state that "if the calculated value is less than the figure from the chi-square distribution table under the assumed level of significance, the null hypothesis (H_0) should be accepted. But if the calculated value is greater than table value, the null hypotheses (H_0) should be rejected and the alternative hypotheses (H_1) should be accepted.

The chi-square formula is presented thus: (Equation 4.1)

$$X^2 \quad = \quad \frac{\sum (fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

Where:

$\sum$ = Summation sign

Fo = Observed frequency

Fe = Expected frequency

X^2 = Chi-square

The degree of freedom for hypotheses tested is gotten thus:

D/f = (number of row – 1) x (Number of column – 1).

Hypothesis One

H_1:   There is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

H_0:   There is no significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Table 4.6: **Distribution of the Observed and Expected Frequencies for Hypothesis One**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X^2cal.	X^2tab.
1.	Question 1	123 (41.69)	100 (33.89)	50 (16.94)	22 (7.45)	295		
2.	Question 2	33 (11.18)	25 (8.47)	103 (34.91)	134 (45.42)	295		
3.	Question 3	100 (33.89)	134 (45.42)	37 (12.54)	24 (8.13)	295		
4.	Question 4	28 (9.49)	56 (18.98)	101 (34.23)	110 (34.23)	295		
5.	Question 5	120 (40.67)	90 (30.50)	50 (16.94)	35 (11.86)	295		
	Total	**404**	**405**	**341**	**325**	**1,475**	**424.94**	**21.026**

"Source: Field Survey, (2021)

The first figure (number) in column SA, A, D and SD in table 4.6 are observed frequencies, representing the number of respondents on each item in statements 1 to 5 based on the level lf their agreements on the items. While the second numbers in bracket are the expected frequencies.

Table 4.7: **Contingency Table for Hypothesis One**

R-C	Fo	Fe	Fo– Fe	(Fo – Fe)^2	$\frac{(Fo – Fe)^2}{Fe}$
1 – 1	123	80.8	42.2	1780.84	22.04
1 – 2	100	81	19	361	4.42
1 – 3	50	68.2	-18.2	331.24	4.85
1 – 4	22	65	-43	1849	28.44
2 – 1	33	80.8	-47.8	2284.84	28.27
2 – 2	25	81	-56	3136	38.71
2 – 3	103	68.2	34.8	1211.04	17.75
2 – 4	134	65	69	4761	73.24
3 – 1	100	80.8	19.2	368.64	4.56
3 – 2	134	81	53	2809	34.67
3 – 3	37	68.2	-31.2	973.44	14.27
3 – 4	24	65	-41	1681	25.86
4 – 1	28	80.8	-52.8	2787.84	34.50
4 – 2	56	81	-25	625	7.71
4 – 3	101	68.2	32.8	1075.84	15.77
4 – 4	110	65	45	2025	31.15
5 – 1	120	80.8	39.8	1536.64	19.01
5 – 2	90	81	9	81	1
5 – 3	50	68.2	-18.2	331.24	4.85
5 – 4	35	65	-30	900	13.84
Total	**1475**	**1475**	**726.4**	**34322.44**	**424.94**

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

X^2 =   424.94

D/f   =   (R - 1) (C - 1)

    =   (5 - 1) (4 - 1)

    =   4 x 3 = 12

    =   12 @ 0.05 levels of significance

Table value = 21.026

Decision

Since the calculated value 424.94 is greater than the table value 21.026 in the statistical table at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1), that there is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Hypothesis Two

H_1: There is a significant relationship between adoption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

H_0: There is no significant relationship between adoption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Table 4.8: **Distribution of the Observed and Expected Frequencies for Hypothesis Two**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X^2cal.	X^2tab.
1.	Question 6	144 (48.81)	88 (29.83)	41 (13.89)	22 (7.45)	295		
2.	Question 7	92 (31.18)	124 (42.03)	45 (15.25)	34 (11.52)	295		
3.	Question 8	105 (35.59)	98 (33.22)	61 (20.67)	31 (10.50)	295		
4.	Question 9	56 (18.98)	44 (14.91)	73 (24.74)	122 (41.35)	295		
5.	Question 10	141 (47.79)	82 (27.79)	46 (15.59)	26 (8.81)	295		
	Total	538	436	266	235	1475	253.21	21.026

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

The first figure (number) in column SA, A, D and SD in table 4.8 are observed frequencies, representing the number of respondents on each item in statements 6 to 10 based on the level of their agreements on the items. While the second numbers in bracket are the expected frequencies.

Table 4.9: **Contingency Table for Hypothesis Two**

R-C	Fo	Fe	Fo– Fe	(Fo – Fe)^2	(Fo – Fe)^2 / Fe
1 – 1	144	107.6	36.4	1324.96	12.31
1 – 2	88	87.2	0.8	0.64	0.01
1 – 3	41	53.2	-12.2	148.84	2.79
1 – 4	22	47	-25	625	13.29
2 – 1	92	107.6	-15.6	243.36	2.26
2 – 2	124	87.2	36.8	1354.24	15.53

2 – 3	45	53.2	-8.2	67.24	1.26
2 – 4	34	47	-13	169	3.59
3 – 1	105	107.6	-2.6	6.76	0.06
3 – 2	98	87.2	10.8	116.64	1.33
3 – 3	61	53.2	7.8	60.84	1.14
3 – 4	31	47	-16	256	5.44
4 – 1	56	107.6	-51.6	2662.56	24.74
4 – 2	44	87.2	-43.2	1866.24	21,40
4 – 3	73	53.2	19.8	392.04	7.36
4 – 4	122	47	75	5625	119.68
5 – 1	141	107.6	33.4	1115.56	10.36
5 – 2	82	87.2	-5.2	27.04	0.31
5 – 3	46	53.2	-7.2	51.84	0.97
5 – 4	26	47	-21	441	9.38
Total	**1475**	**1475**	**441.6**	**16554.8**	**253.21**

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

X^2 = 253.21

D/f = (R - 1) (C - 1)

= (5 - 1) (4 - 1)

= 4 x 3 = 12

= 12 at 0.05 levels of significance

Table value = 21.026

Decision

Since the calculated value 253.21 is greater than the table value in the statistical table at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1), that there is a significant relationship between the adaption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Hypothesis Three

H_1: There is a significant relationship between inefficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

H_0: There is no significant relationship between efficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

Table 4.10: **Distribution of the Observed and Expected Frequencies for Hypothesis Three**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X^2cal.	X^2tab.
1.	Question 11	117 (39.66)	128 (43.38)	32 (10.84)	18 (6.10)	295		
2.	Question 12	127 (43.05)	112 (37.96)	21 (7.11)	35 (11.86)	295		
3.	Question 13	18 (6.10)	23 (7.79)	150 (50.84)	104 (35.25)	295		
4.	Question 14	105 (35.59)	97 (32.88)	53 (17.96)	40 (13.55)	295		
5.	Question 15	28 (9.49)	30 (10.16)	77 (26.10)	160 (54.23)	295		
	Total	**395**	**360**	**273**	**357**	**1475**	**671.31**	**21.026**

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

Table 4.10 shows responses to question 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 considered to be relevant to the hypothesis. The first figure (number) in column SA, A, D and SD in table 4.3 are observed frequencies, representing the number of respondents on each item in statements 11 to 15 based on the level of their agreements on the items. While the second numbers in brackets are the expected frequencies (see Appendix V for the calculation of expected frequencies).

Table 4.11: **Contingency Table for Hypothesis Three**

R-C	Fo	Fe	Fo– Fe	$(Fo – Fe)^2$	$\dfrac{(Fo – Fe)^2}{Fe}$
1 – 1	117	79	38	1444	18.27
1 – 2	128	72	56	3136	43.55
1 – 3	32	54.6	-22.6	510.76	9.35
1 – 4	18	71.4	-53.4	2851.56	39.93
2 – 1	127	79	48	2304	29.16
2 – 2	112	72	40	1600	22.22
2 – 3	21	54.6	-33.6	1128.96	20.67
2 – 4	35	71.4	-36.4	1324.96	18.55
3 – 1	18	79	61	3721	47.10
3 – 2	23	72	-49	2401	33.34
3 – 3	150	54.6	95.4	9101.16	166.68

3 – 4	104	71.4	32.6	1062.76	14.88
4 – 1	105	79	26	676	8.55
4 – 2	97	72	25	625	8.68
4 – 3	53	54.6	-1.6	2.56	0.04
4 – 4	40	71.4	-31.4	985.96	13.80
5 – 1	28	79	-51	2601	32.92
5 – 2	30	72	-42	1764	24.5
5 – 3	77	54.6	22.4	501.76	9.18
5 – 4	160	71.4	88.6	7849.96	109.94
Total	**1475**	**1385**	**854**	**37742.44**	**671.31**

Source: Field Survey, (2021)

X^2 = 671.31

D/f = (R - 1) (C - 1)

= (5 - 1) (4 - 1)

= 4 x 3 = 12

= 12 at 0.05 levels of significance

Table value = 21.026

Decision

Since the calculated value 671.31 is greater than the table value in the statistical table at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1), that there is a significant relationship between inefficient utilization of funds budgeted for agriculture and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

FINDING

The above findings are summarized thus:

i. The Chi Square values (X^2cal. 424.94; X^2tab.21.026 at 0.05 level of sig.) were obtained for the analysis of democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State. This analysis shows that on the test of significance, since the calculated value of 424.94 was greater than the table value of 21.026, then there is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State. ii. The Chi Square values (X^2cal. 253.21; X^2tab. 21.026 at 0.05 level of sig.) were obtained for the analysis of adoption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State. This analysis pointed out that on the test of significance, since the calculated value of 253.21 is greater than the table value of

21.06, then there is a significant relationship between adoption of modern farming methods and food security in Akwa Ibom State.

iii. Given the Chi Square values (X^2cal.671.31; X^2tab. 21.06 at 0.05 level of sig.) were obtained for the analysis of the relationship between inefficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture and food security in Akwa

Ibom State. This analysis shows that inefficient utilization of budgeted funds for agriculture has a significant impact on food security in Akwa Ibom State.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section deals with the analysis of findings of the study. It is also intended to show how the X^2 decisions relate to the statement of the problem. The study was carried out to examine the impacts of democratic governance on food security in Nigeria using Akwa Ibom State as a unit of analysis. The three hypotheses formulated for the study were used for the calculation of responses to the questionnaire. As could be evident from the X^2 calculation and analysis of the available data, the three null hypotheses tested were rejected in favour of the alternate hypotheses which indicate that the decision taken goes further to affirm that democratic governance in Nigeria at large and Akwa Ibom State in particular have significant impacts on food security.

In analysing hypothesis one which states that there is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security in Akwa Ibom State, the results from the analysis showed that majority of the respondents were of the view that there is a significant relationship between democratic governance and food security. From the findings, the study revealed that democratic government influences food security in such a way that if government put in place proper institutional and legal framework to drive the agricultural sector to bring about food availability, accessibility, stability and utilization, food security would be guaranteed. This finding agrees with Moore (2004) who argued that democratic governance has resulted in a better life for the citizens due to people oriented policies and programmes that translate into food security. Similarly, Samarasinhe (1994) agreed with this position when he noted that there was an improvement in social welfare in some countries as a result of democratic governance because the competition for votes of people promotes welfare policies such as agricultural policies to boost food production for the attainment of food security. To him, numerous examples abound in favour of the positive impact that democratic governance has had on the people and the country at large.

In analysing hypothesis two which states that improved food security in Akwa Ibom State is a function of the adoption of modern farming methods, the calculated X^2 value was greater than the table value leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and retention of the alternate hypothesis. This implies that the adoption of modern farm methods affect food security in Akwa Ibom State and this explains the positive consequence of adoption of modern farming methods in achieving food security. The study maintained that when modern techniques are not applied in the production of food, achieving food security would be difficult in view of the fact that the continuous usage of rudimentary farming methods would hamper accelerated food production that would meet increasing food demand and supply in the country. Ojo and Adebayo (2012) agreed with this finding by observing that despite the use of indigenous crop rotation methods, food insecurity has been on the rise as these techniques are not enough to meet the demand of the fast-growing population. To them, there is need for mechanization of agriculture in Nigeria to improve production through the use of equipment, machineries and implements. According to them, although some large-scale farmers have been using the mechanized farming system, there is the need to promote mechanized farming amongst small-holder farmers. In the same vein, Oni, *et al*. (2009), also observed that irrigated farms in the dry Savannah agro-ecological zones gives higher productivity than non-irrigated farms. Also, supporting the findings, Ojo and Adebayo (2012), again opine that agricultural biotechnology which involves genetically modified food, though still not generally accepted due to unresolved safety issues, has an immense potential to significantly reduce the global food security challenges.

Adoption of modern methods cannot be entirely Western-based. Indigenous or locally developed farm practices that take local situations into account are equally desirable. For instance, farm clearing needs to move away from the traditional bush burning which continues to affects the state.

In analysing hypothesis three which states that inefficient utilization of budgeted fund for agriculture tends to affect food security in Akwa Ibom State, it was observed by the researcher that efficient utilization of budgeted funds for agricultural purposes positively affects food production and enhance food security. This implies that ensuring food security in Akwa Ibom State is a function of efficient utilization of fund. This means that for Akwa Ibom State to be food secure, agricultural budget must be efficiently utilized. By implication, this means that funds meant for agricultural activities must not be misappropriated or diverted for other activities.

Budgeting enables farmers and government to plan the allocation of resources, direct the flow of work and focus on organizational efforts, control the utilization of resources to ensure effective and efficient achievement of goals

and desired outcome. This finding agrees with Oni, *et al*. (2009), that access to funds has been shown empirically in various studies to have improved farmers' productivity. It is important for smallholder farmers to have access to fund particularly during the sowing period to enable them afford quality seedlings, pesticides, fertilizers, as well as hire/ purchase equipment needed for production. Funds can also be needed for labour support during harvest and for storage facility.

CONCLUSION

One of the major objectives the Nigerian state must pursue in its nascent democratic era is the attainment of food security. A country that cannot formulate and effectively implement sound and realistic agricultural and food policies may find it difficult to feed the citizens as catalyst for sustainable democracy. In the words of Daniel (1953:9) "welfare constitutes a third objective of modern government". Any government whether it is democratic or dictatorial that makes her citizens go hungry will definitely run into trouble. That welfare is an objective of all modern states is a fact comparable to their common pursuit of national economic health. Welfare activities are engaged in, because people the world over demand it from their governments. Thus, food is an essential component of welfarism.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study has gone a long way towards enhancing our understanding of the impact of democratic governance on food security in Nigeria with particular reference to Akwa Ibom State, and in view of findings of this study, it is obvious that Akwa Ibom State Government has made some progress in the attainment of food security in the state. However, in order to sustain and improve on the successes already achieved, the following recommendations were made:

i. Public policy makers should prioritize food as an indispensable component of welfarism and as such should develop sufficient political will to achieve increased food production, evolved sound food policies in order to attain food security.

ii. Budgetary allocation to the agricultural sector should be increased in order for the sector to have sufficient funds to carry out its programmes towards the attainment of food security. Also, mechanisms should be deployed to monitor the disbursement of funds allocated to the sector.

iii. Adoption of modern farming methods should be prioritized. Government through its agricultural extension units should enlighten farmers on the imperative of adopting modern farming methods. Farmers on the other hand should embrace these modern farming innovations in order to increase their crop yield.

iv. Government should provide basic farm inputs such as fertilizers, tractors, improved seedlings amongst others to farmers in order to increase crop yield to ensure food availability, accessibility, and affordability in the state.

REFERENCES

1. Babawale, T. (2007). Nigeria in the Crisis of Governance and Development: Retrospective and Prospective Analysis of Selected Issues and Events: The Political Economy of Development, Governance, and Globalization. Concept Publication: Lagos, 47p
2. Barak, A. (2006). The Judge in a Democracy. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 4p 7. Bliss, A. (2002). Art of Governance. (Retrieved 20th June, 2013) .http//www.academic edu.
3. Clement, A. C. (2014). Assessment of Food Security Status among Rural Farming Households in Guma Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. Economic policy Research Department. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) Ibadan, Oyo State.
4. Adetiba, T. and Rahim, A. (2007). Good Governance and Sustainable Socio-Political Development. Research in Humanities and Social Science 2(10) 2012 Online (Retrieved on 12th June, 2013).
5. Amaza, P. S., Umeh, J. C., Hesen, J and Adejobi, A. O. (2006). Determinants and Measurement of Food Insecurity in Nigeria: Some Empirical Policy Guide. Paper presented at International Association of Agricultural Economists' Conference, Gold Coast, Australia from 12th to 26 August 2005.

6. Anderson, M. and Cook, J. (1999). Community Food Security: Practice in need of theory. Agriculture and Human Values. 16 (2): 141-150.
7. Cooper, E. F. (2013). Evaluating Household Food Insecurity: Application and Insights from Rural Malaysia. Ecology of Food and Nutrition, 52(4):294-316.
8. Diamond, L. (2004). What is Democracy? http://www.standard.edudiamond/Iraq/what's Democracy (Retrieved on 9th January, 2004).
9. Javie, I. (2006) Karl Popper: Life and Time and Values in a World of Fact, Vol, 1 of Karl Popper: A Centenary Assessment. Ashgate Publishing Ltd.: Berlin.
10. Kelson, H. (1955). Ethics: Foundation of Democracy Vol. 66, No. 1 part 2. 1-101.
11. Maharjan, K. L., and Chhetri, A. K (2006). Household Food Security in Rural Areas of Nepal: Relationship between Socio-economic Characteriqstics and Food Security Status. Paper presented at the International Association of Agricultural Economists' Conference, Gold Coast, Australia. August 12-26.
12. Merton, R. (1949). Social Theory and Social Structure. The Free Press: Glencoe, 12p
13. Nuassbaum, M. (2000). Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
14. Ojo, E. O, and Adebayo, P. F. (2012). Food security in Nigeria: An overview. European Journal of Sustainable Development 1,199-222.
15. Oni, O., Nkonya, E., Pender, J., Philips, D and Kato, E. (2009). Trends and Drivers of Agricultural Productivity in Nigeria. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Abuja.
16. Moore, M. (2004). Democratic Governance and Poverty Reduction. Paper, Centre for the Future State. The Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Sussex, United Kingdom.
17. Samarasinghe, S. W. (1994). Democracy and Democratization in Developing Countries. Massachusetts Data for Decision Making Project UNDP (2009). UNDP Annual Report 2009. New York.
18. Vahanem, T. (1990). The Process of Democratization: A Comparative Study of 172 State 1980- 1988. Russak Publishers: New York, 232p
19. Webster New Dictionary (1995). Black and Leventhal Publishers, Inc: New York.
20. UNDP (1997) Governance for sustainable human development: A UNDP Policy Document. New York.
21. Shaw, D. J. (2007).World Food Security: A History since 1945. Macmillan: Palgrave