

# A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE RESPONSE OF CROP PERFORMANCE TO FERTILIZER AND SOIL TYPES

<sup>1</sup>OYEGOKE, O. A. <sup>2</sup>OGUNWOLE, B. A. AND <sup>3</sup>ASABI, O. O.

Department of Statistics, Osun State Polytechnic, Iree.

Correspondence author e-mail: odunayo4mine@gmail.com

Being A Paper Submitted for Publication in Journal ofIJOSTEM

## ABSTRACT

*In the study of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), analysis was carried out to determine the response of fertilizer types and soil types on the yields of three types of crop. The data used for the analysis was collected from Obasanjo farms Nigeria limited, analysis was carried out based on multivariate statistics which is Pillai 's trace. Hence the result confirmed there is no enough evidence to show a significant relationship between fertilizer and crop yields and for the soil types, we therefore reject the null hypothesis at specified level of significance and conclude that there is no enough evidence to show a significant relationship between soil type and crop yields, and for soil type and fertilizer, we also therefore reject the null hypothesis at specified level of significance and conclude that there is a significant relationship between soil type, fertilizers and crop yields. Therefore, future researchers should carry out a similar research work with more than three interaction effects to compare the results, also find out among the fertilizer types specifically which one has more effect.*

**Keywords:** Fertilizer, Crop, Soil and Interaction, Multivariate Analysis, Pillai's trace.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is simply an ANOVA with several dependent variables. This is to say, ANOVA test for the difference in means between two or more groups, while MANOVA test for the difference in two or more vectors of means. Harsha Nimkar (2003) define Multivariate analysis as a process of involving multiple dependent variables resulting in one outcome. It has been widely employed in experimental sciences, such as biology (Tilman et al., 1997) and psychology (Reis et al., 2015). This explains that the majority of the problems in the real world are Multivariate. For example, we cannot predict the weather of any year based on the season. There are multiple factors like pollution, humidity, precipitation, etc. Also, MANOVA reduces the chances of Type 1 error that would

result if multiple ANOVA were used and also aids in the discovery of differences that might remain hidden with ANOVA. The price of fertilizers in rural areas of Africa is usually at least twice the international price. African countries subsidized fertilizers; however, the removal of fertilizers subsidies by most African governments has increased fertilizer prices in relation to crop prices in many of these countries Bumb et al., (1996).Alley and Vanlauwe (2009) defined soil fertility as the capacity of soil to retain, cycle and supply essential nutrients for plant growth over extended periods of time. Makinde et al., (2010) earlier obtained similar increase in plant height of *A. cruentus*, though with increased organ mineral fertilizer applications in orthic luvisol and Dystric fluvisol soils gave similar results of increased leafy productivity of grain amaranth when the

combination of poultry manure and urea-N fertilization was compared with conventional fertilizer application.

In Adebayo et al., (2014), field experiment was carried out at the teaching and research farm of Kwara state university, Malete, Ilorin, to evaluate the effect of compost, organ mineral, and inorganic fertilizers on the growth and yield of *Amaranthus Caudatus* as well as its residual effects. *Amaranthus* was growth with compost grade B (unlamented compost), organ mineral fertilizer Grade A (compost amended with mineral fertilizer). And NPK 15-15-15 and no fertilizer (control). All the treatments except control were applied at the rate of 100kgN/ha. The results indicated that *Amaranthus* yield of 18.9t/ha produced from grade A was significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher than 17.6t/ha obtained from NPK fertilizer. Residual effect of *Amaranthus* growth parameters such as plant height, number of leaves, and yield values obtained from grade A was also significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher than that of NPK, compost, and control values. Thus, organ mineral fertilizer could be used in cultivation of *Amaranthus Caudatus* in Ilorin and in similar type of soil in similar agro ecology. Rachel et al., (2016) *Ionicera Maackii* is an invasive Asian shrub naturalized in North America that has negative effects on forest understory vegetation. Aqueous extracts of leaves and roots of this plant have been shown to inhibit germination of several species. He examined the extent to which field-collected soils conditioned by *L. Maackii* growth, with and without additions of *L. Maackii* extracts, had effects on growth, morphology, and reproduction of *Arabidopsis thaliana* in a greenhouse setting. We also examine the effect of nutrient addition to the same soils on the performance of *A. thaliana*, whether plant responses to nutrients varied among *L. Maackii*- conditioned and unconditioned soils, and whether the effects of *L. Maackii* extracts varied in soils with different histories and fertility. Plant grown in forest soil collected from a site where *L. Maackii*

was present grew slower and flowered later than plants grown in an unconditioned soil, but ended up being larger, with more leaves, branches and a higher total seed output. Nutrient addition had a positive effect on performance of *A. thaliana*, but when nutrients were added with extracts of *L. Maackii* roots and leaves, the positive effects of nutrient were greatly diminished. Inhibiting plant response to resource opportunities is a potentially important indirect effect of all alchemical. When direct effects of extracts on growth were seen, leaf extracts had a greater effect than root extracts. While the most important impacts of *L. maackii* in the field are undoubtedly due to competition for light and moisture, evidence for all allopathic effects of this plant is growing.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

### Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is an extension of common analysis of variance (ANOVA). In MANOVA, the number of response variables is increased to two or more. The hypothesis concerns a comparison of vectors of group means. When only two groups are being compared, the results are identical to Hotelling's  $T^2$  procedure. The multivariate extension of the F-test is not completely direct. Instead, several test statistics are available, such as Wilks' Lambda and Lawley's trace. The actual distributions of these statistics are difficult to calculate, so we rely on approximations based on the F-distribution.

### Statistical Analysis of the Fixed Effects Model

Mathematical Model - Split Block.

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \gamma_{ij} + \delta_k + (\alpha\delta)_{ik} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

Where  $Y_{ijk}$  is the observation in the  $i$ th main plot treatment and  $k^{\text{th}}$  subplot treatment for the  $j$ th block.

$\mu$  is the overall mean,

$a_i$  is the main plot treatment effect,

$e_{ijk}$  is the subplot error (error)

$p_j$  is the block effect and

$v_{ij}$  is the main plot error.

$S_k$  is the subplot treatment effect,

$(aS)_{ik}$  is the main plot and subplot treatment interaction effect and

MANOVA Test Statistics For a particular p-variable multivariate test, assume that the matrices H and E have h and e degrees of freedom, respectively. Let  $\lambda_i$ ,  $\mu_i$ , and  $\nu_i$  be the eigenvalues of  $H(E+Hy)^{-1}$ ,  $Hff^1$ , and  $E(E+Hr^1)^{-1}$  respectively. Note that these eigenvalues are related as follows:

Source	d.f.	SSP.
<b>Blocks</b>	$b-1$	<b>B</b>
<b>Treatments</b>	$a-1$	<b>H</b>
<b>Error</b>	$(a-1)(b-1)$	<b>E</b>
<b>Total</b>	$ab-1$	<b>T</b>

SSP stands for the sum of squares and cross product matrix.

Wilks' Lambda is defined as follows:

$$A_{p,h,e} = \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'}{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{H})\mathbf{1}}$$

$$A_{p,h,e} = \prod_{j=1}^h (1 - \lambda_j)$$

With  $e \geq 2$ ; p, the following approximation based on F-distribution is used to determine significance levels:

$$F = \frac{(f-t)(1-A)}{p h - 2} \quad \text{Where: } f = \frac{p-h+1}{2}$$

$$g = \frac{p h - 2}{2}$$

$$t = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{p^2 h^2 - 4}{p^2 - h^2 - 5}} & \text{if } p^2 - h^2 - 5 > 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This approximation is exact if p or h  $\geq 2$ .

**Lawley - Hotelling Trace** The trace statistic,  $T_i$ , is defined as follows:

$$T_i = e \sum_{j=1}^{\min(p,h)} \lambda_j$$

Where  $e = \min(p,h)$

The following approximation based on the F-distribution is used to determine significance levels:

$$F_{\alpha} = \frac{T_i^2}{ce}$$

Where:

$$a = ph, \quad b = 4 + (a + 2)(B - 1), \quad c = \frac{a(b - 2)}{b(e - p - 1)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$B = \frac{(e + h - p - 1)}{(e - p - 3)(e - p)}$$

**Pillai's Trace**

Pillai's trace statistic,  $y(s)$ , is defined as follows:

$$y(s) = \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j = \text{tr}(H(E + H)^{-1})$$

Where  $s = \min(p, h)$

The following approximation based on the F-distribution is used to determine significance levels:

$$F_{s(2m+s+1), (2n+s+1)} = \frac{(2n + s + 1)A(s)}{(2m + s + 1)(s - A(s))}$$

Where:

$$s = \min(p, h) \quad m = \frac{IP - h - 1}{2}, \quad \text{and } n = (e - p - 1)/2$$

**Roy's Largest Root**

Roy's largest root,  $cp_{max}$ , is defined as the largest of the  $cp_i$ 's. The following approximation based on the F-distribution is used to determine significance levels:

$$F_{s(2v_1+2), (2v_1+2)} = \frac{2\sqrt{z+2}}{2 + \frac{z}{2}} c_{pmax}$$

Where:

$$s = \min(p, h) \quad v_1 = \frac{IP - h - 1}{2}, \quad \text{and } v_2 = \frac{(e - p - 1)}{2}$$

**The Test to Use**

When the hypothesis degrees of freedom,  $h$ , is one, all four test statistics will lead to identical results. When  $h > 1$ , the four statistics will usually lead to the same result. When they do not, the following guidelines from Tabachnick (1989) may be of some help. Wilks' Lambda, Lawley's trace, and Roy's largest root are often more powerful than Pillai's trace if  $h > 1$  and one-dimension accounts for most of the separation among groups. Pillai's trace is more robust to departures from assumptions than the other three.

**Research Hypotheses**

The research hypotheses are as follows:

**HYPOTHESIS 1**

$H_0$ : there is no significant relationship between the fertilizer used and crop yield.

$H_1$ : there is a significant relationship between the fertilizer used and crop yield.

Level of significance: 0.05

Decision rule: reject  $H_0$  if p-value is less than the level of significance. Accept  $H_0$  if otherwise.

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

$H_0$ : there is no significant relationship between the soil type and crop yield.

$H_1$ : there is a significant relationship between the soil type and crop yield.

Level of significance: 0.05

Decision rule: reject  $H_0$  if p-value is less than the level of significance. Accept  $H_0$  if otherwise.

**HYPOTHESIS 3**

H<sub>0</sub>: there is no significant relationship between the soil type, fertilizer type and crop yield.

H<sub>1</sub>: there is a significant relationship between the soil type, fertilizer type and crop yield.

Level of significance: 0.05.

Decision rule: reject H<sub>0</sub> if p-value is less than the level of significance. Accept H<sub>0</sub> if otherwise.

**Data Used for Analysis**

The data below obtained from Obasanjo farm Nigeria Limited, Ota, Ogun State. The Statistical Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and PYTHON was used in analyzing the data.

**Table 2: Presentation of Data**

WEEKS	FERTILIZER	CLAY SOIL			LOAMY SOIL			SANDY SOIL		
		P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>
2	NPK	11.4	10.2	11.6	10.1	10.8	9.7	11.2	12.0	10.0
	15:15:15	10.2	9.8	8.7	8.6	8.8	8.9	9.7	9.8	9.6
	POULTRY CATTLE	9.8	8.6	8.2	8.1	8.7	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.0
4	NPK	18.7	18.8	19.8	18.9	18.5	19.2	18.2	18.1	18.1
	15:15:15	18.0	18.3	19.7	18.8	18.3	18.9	19.2	19.4	19.3
	POULTRY CATTLE	18.1	18.7	19.1	18.6	18.7	18.2	18.5	18.6	19.2
6	NPK	25.2	23.7	21.5	24.2	24.7	26.2	21.2	20.2	20.0
	15:15:15	22.4	20.4	25.4	23.7	26.2	25.2	28.5	28.9	20.2
	POULTRY CATTLE	22.4	20.3	26.2	25.4	22.2	26.2	22.2	22.4	22.6
8	NPK	21.2	25.1	22.3	24.6	23.1	21.2	20.2	20.4	20.1
	15:15:15	21.3	28.1	29.2	20.1	24.3	23.2	28.0	28.3	29.5
	POULTRY CATTLE	24.3	24.4	21.5	21.2	25.1	29.2	21.4	20.2	21.6
10	NPK	25.7	26.2	26.1	28.9	28.7	29.0	25.2	23.7	21.5
	15:15:15	21.2	28.6	28.0	28.2	22.3	28.9	18.2	18.4	18.8
	POULTRY CATTLE	28.2	25.0	21.3	28.0	29.0	26.3	10.1	10.4	10.6

**Source: Data collected from Obasanjo farm Nigeria limited Ota, Ogun State from (2weeks to 10weeks). P<sub>1</sub>=Tomatoes, p<sub>2</sub> =maize, p<sub>3</sub>= watermelon.**

**THE MANOVA TEST.**

**Table 3:**

		Multivariate Tests <sup>a</sup>					Partial Eta Squared
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.925	139.478 <sup>b</sup>	3.000	34.000	<.001	.925
	Wilks' Lambda	.075	139.478 <sup>b</sup>	3.000	34.000	<.001	.925
	Hotelling's Trace	12.307	139.478 <sup>b</sup>	3.000	34.000	<.001	.925
	Roy's Largest Root	12.307	139.478 <sup>b</sup>	3.000	34.000	<.001	.925
fertilizers	Pillai's Trace	.076	.458	6.000	70.000	.837	.038
	Wilks' Lambda	.925	.452 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	68.000	.841	.038
	Hotelling's Trace	.081	.444	6.000	66.000	.846	.039
	Roy's Largest Root	.074	.869 <sup>c</sup>	3.000	35.000	.467	.069
soil	Pillai's Trace	.094	.576	6.000	70.000	.748	.047
	Wilks' Lambda	.906	.572 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	68.000	.751	.048
	Hotelling's Trace	.103	.568	6.000	66.000	.754	.049
	Roy's Largest Root	.100	1.172 <sup>c</sup>	3.000	35.000	.334	.091
fertilizers * soil	Pillai's Trace	.285	.946	12.000	108.000	.504	.095
	Wilks' Lambda	.732	.942	12.000	90.247	.510	.099
	Hotelling's Trace	.343	.933	12.000	98.000	.517	.103
	Roy's Largest Root	.249	2.237 <sup>c</sup>	4.000	36.000	.084	.199

a. Design: Intercept + fertilizers + soil + fertilizers \* soil

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

**Hypothesis 1**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the fertilizers and crop yield

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between fertilizers and crop yield.

**Decision rule:** We reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05.

**Conclusion:** Since the p value of the Pillai's Trace statistic for fertilizers is 0.837, we therefore accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is not enough evidence to show a significant relationship between fertilizers and crop yield.

**Hypothesis 2**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the soil type and crop yield

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between soil type and crop yield.

**Decision rule:** We reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05.

**Conclusion:** Since the p-value of the Pillai's Trace statistic for soil type is 0.748, we therefore accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is not enough evidence to show a significant relationship between soil type and crop yield.

**Hypothesis 3**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the soil type, fertilizers, and crop yield

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between soil type, fertilizers, and crop yield.

**Decision rule:** We reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05.

**Conclusion:** Since the p-value of the Pillai's Trace statistic for soil type and fertilizers is 0.504, we therefore accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is not enough evidence to show a significant relationship between soil type, fertilizers, and crop yield.

**Test of Between-subject Effects**

We test each independent variable in the model, plus the model as a whole to ascertain the ability to account for variation in the dependent variables.

Table 4

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects								
Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	
Corrected Model	Tomatoes	86.311 <sup>a</sup>	8	10.789	.246	.979	.052	
	Maize	131.595 <sup>b</sup>	8	16.449	.395	.916	.081	
	WaterMelon	129.368 <sup>c</sup>	8	16.171	.340	.944	.070	
Intercept	Tomatoes	17491.641	1	17491.641	398.612	<.001	.917	
	Maize	18260.939	1	18260.939	438.147	<.001	.924	
	WaterMelon	17976.008	1	17976.008	377.576	<.001	.913	
fertilizers	Tomatoes	11.411	2	5.706	.130	.878	.007	
	Maize	10.622	2	5.311	.127	.881	.007	
	WaterMelon	17.665	2	8.833	.186	.831	.010	
soil	Tomatoes	21.896	2	10.948	.249	.781	.014	
	Maize	51.035	2	25.518	.612	.548	.033	
	WaterMelon	85.185	2	42.593	.895	.418	.047	
fertilizers * soil	Tomatoes	53.004	4	13.251	.302	.875	.032	
	Maize	69.938	4	17.485	.420	.793	.045	
	WaterMelon	26.517	4	6.629	.139	.967	.015	
Error	Tomatoes	1579.728	36	43.881				
	Maize	1500.395	36	41.678				
	WaterMelon	1713.924	36	47.609				
Total	Tomatoes	19157.680	45					
	Maize	19892.930	45					
	WaterMelon	19819.300	45					
Corrected Total	Tomatoes	1666.039	44					
	Maize	1631.991	44					
	WaterMelon	1843.292	44					

a. R Squared = .052 (Adjusted R Squared = -.159)

b. R Squared = .081 (Adjusted R Squared = -.124)

c. R Squared = .070 (Adjusted R Squared = -.136)

**Conclusion:** As we can see in the p-values in the output above, none of them is lesser than 0.05 which means that even on a plant-by-plant basis, there is also no significant relationship between soil type, fertilizer, and plant growth.

**Post Hoc Test**

We use Scheffe's test to test all pairwise and non-pairwise comparisons of treatment means. To determine whether the mean score in any of the groups differs from the mean score in other groups.

Note: We used the Scheffe test because it provides a more sensitive test of non-pairwise comparisons than Tukey's test in small sample experiments.

Table 4: Fertilizers

Multiple Comparisons							
Scheffe							
Dependent Variable	(I) fertilizers	(J) fertilizers	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tomatoes	CATTLE	NPK	-.1233	2.4189	.879	-7.409	4.943
		POULTRY	-.633	2.4189	.966	-6.809	5.543
	NPK	CATTLE	1.233	2.4189	.879	-4.943	7.409
		POULTRY	.600	2.4189	.970	-5.576	6.776
	POULTRY	CATTLE	.633	2.4189	.966	-5.543	6.809
		NPK	-.600	2.4189	.970	-6.776	5.576
Maize	CATTLE	NPK	-.787	2.3573	.946	-6.805	5.232
		POULTRY	-1.167	2.3573	.885	-7.185	4.852
	NPK	CATTLE	.787	2.3573	.946	-5.232	6.805
		POULTRY	-.380	2.3573	.987	-6.399	5.639
	POULTRY	CATTLE	1.167	2.3573	.885	-4.852	7.185
		NPK	.380	2.3573	.987	-5.639	6.399
WaterMelon	CATTLE	NPK	-.413	2.5195	.987	-6.846	6.019
		POULTRY	-1.487	2.5195	.841	-7.919	4.946
	NPK	CATTLE	.413	2.5195	.987	-6.019	6.846
		POULTRY	-1.073	2.5195	.913	-7.506	5.359
	POULTRY	CATTLE	1.487	2.5195	.841	-4.946	7.919
		NPK	1.073	2.5195	.913	-5.359	7.506

Based on observed means.  
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 47.609.

**Table 5: Soil**

**Multiple Comparisons**

Scheffe

Dependent Variable	(I) soil	(J) soil	Mean		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
			Difference (I-J)	Std. Error		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tomatoes	CLAY	LOAMY	-.607	2.4189	.969	-6.783	5.569
		SANDY	1.080	2.4189	.905	-5.096	7.256
	LOAMY	CLAY	-.607	2.4189	.969	-5.569	6.783
		SANDY	1.687	2.4189	.785	-4.489	7.863
	SANDY	CLAY	-1.080	2.4189	.905	-7.256	5.096
		LOAMY	-1.687	2.4189	.785	-7.863	4.489
Maize	CLAY	LOAMY	-.880	2.3573	.933	-6.899	5.139
		SANDY	1.687	2.3573	.776	-4.332	7.705
	LOAMY	CLAY	-.880	2.3573	.933	-5.139	6.899
		SANDY	2.567	2.3573	.558	-3.452	8.585
	SANDY	CLAY	-1.687	2.3573	.776	-7.705	4.332
		LOAMY	-2.567	2.3573	.558	-8.585	3.452
WaterMelon	CLAY	LOAMY	-.727	2.5195	.959	-7.159	5.706
		SANDY	2.487	2.5195	.618	-3.946	8.919
	LOAMY	CLAY	-.727	2.5195	.959	-5.706	7.159
		SANDY	3.213	2.5195	.451	-3.219	9.646
	SANDY	CLAY	-2.487	2.5195	.618	-8.919	3.946
		LOAMY	-3.213	2.5195	.451	-9.646	3.219

Based on observed means.  
 The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 47.609.

**Findings:**

As we can see in the p-values in both tables above, none of them is less than 0.05 which means that comparing the effect of each of our categorical classes of independent variables did not show any significant relationship between plant growth in any case.

Although, for post hoc testing, it only makes sense to use Scheffe's test if the analysis of variance provides evidence of significant differences among means but we proceeded with inspecting the posthoc analysis for benefit of the doubt.

**Discussion and Findings**

The result obtained from the test of homogeneity or equality of variance shows that there is no equality of dependent variable across the group at 5% level of significance. And from the multivariate analysis result we observed that the fertilizer types and any interaction with fertilizer

types has no enough evidence significant effect on the crop performance, there by accepting the null hypothesis at specified level of significance, whereas the remaining factors and interaction has no significant effect on the crop performance. Thus, this signifies that fertilizer types have a strong impact on the performance of crop; this was even justified from the ANOVA result.

**REFERENCES**

Adebayo O. Abayomi and Ojo J. Adebayo (2014). Effect of Fertilizer Types on the Growth and Yield of *Amaranthus caudatus* in Ilorin, Southern Guinea, Savanna Zone of Nigeria. *Hindawi Publishing Corporation Advances in Agriculture Volume 2014, Article ID 947062, 5 pages*  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/947062>

- Alley and Vanlauwe (2009). An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Bumb B. (2002). An Action Plan for Developing Sustainable Agricultural Input Supply System in Malawi. IFDC Publications, Alabama, USA.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D. L. (2016). Applied multivariate statistical concepts. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harsha Nimkar (2003). Fertilizer use and maize production in sub-Sahara Africa. Econ. Work. Pap. 96-01. CIMMYT, Mexico City.
- Holloway, I.N. and Dunn, O.J (1967). the robustness of Hotelling T<sup>2</sup>. Journal of the American statistical association, 62, 124-136.
- Makinde E.A., Samuel A.L., Ojeniyi S.O. & Odedina J.N. (2010). Effects of Organic, Organomineral and NPK Fertilizer Treatments on The Nutrient Uptake of Amaranthus Cruentus (L) on Two Soil Types in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Central European Agriculture* 12(1):114-123. DOI:10.5513/JCEA0J/12.1.887
- Rachel E. McNeish, Benbow M. Eric & McEwan W. Ryan. (2016). Removal of the Invasive Shrub, *Lonicera maackii* (Amur Honeysuckle), from a Headwater Stream Riparian Zone Shifts Taxonomic and Functional Composition of the Aquatic Biota  
Published online by Cambridge University Press
- Shanshan Qiu, Jun Wang (2015). Effects of storage temperature and time on internal quality of satsuma mandarin (Citrus unshiu mare.) by means of E-nose and E-tongue based on two-way MANOVA analysis and random forest
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. (2019). Using multivariate statistics (7th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Tilman, D., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Reich, P., Ritchie, M., & Siemann, E. (1997). The influence of functional diversity and composition on ecosystem processes. *Science*, 277(5330), 1300-1302

**AN APPRAISAL OF THE APPLICABLE PRACTICE, PROCEDURES AND RULES  
OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COURT OF NIGERIA**

**AFOLABI, SAKA ADEBAYO ESQ**

08033490693

E-mail: [af00092@gmail.com](mailto:af00092@gmail.com)

**AND**

**ABODERIN LAWRENCE OMO TOSE ESQ**

08030423106

E-mail: [larryomotose@gmail.com](mailto:larryomotose@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

*The National Industrial Court was established by the National Industrial Court Act 2006 and the third alteration 2010 of the Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. It was formerly known as Industrial Arbitration Panel (IAP). This paper discusses the Applicable Practice Procedure and Rules of the National Industrial Court of Nigeria. It also discusses the court's practice directions, explains the intervention of the court in criminal cases as guided by the Criminal Procedures Code, Penal Code and Evidence Act. It discusses the effects of non compliance with the Practice and Procedure of the Court, the article also delved into the Structure of the Court, its Operations, Division of the Court, the requirements for the appointment of judges of the Court. The article eventually concludes and makes recommendations that would be of immense benefits to the stakeholders in the administration of the National Industrial Court of Nigeria and the Judiciary.*

**Keywords: Practice, Procedure, Rules, National Industrial Court.**

**Introduction**

Section 12 of the National Industrial Court Act 2006 provides as follows:

- “(1) *The jurisdiction vested in the Court shall, so far as practice and procedure are concerned, be exercised in the manner provided by this Act or any other enactment or by such rules and orders of court as may be made pursuant to this Act or, in the absence of any such provisions, in substantial conformity with the practice and procedure of the Court existing immediately before the commencement of this Act.*
- (2) *Subject to this Act and any rules made thereunder, the Court-*
- (a) *“May regulate its procedure and proceedings as it thinks fit; and*

*(b) Shall be bound by the Evidence Act but may depart from it in the interest of justice”*

**The National Industrial Court Rules**

The National Industrial Court Act 2006<sup>1</sup> empowers the President of the court to make rules regulating the civil procedure of the court. The President of the Court Honourable Justice Babatunde Adeniran Adejumo exercised the powers conferred on him by the Act made the National Industrial Court Rules 2007 which came into operation on 1st day of August, 2007.

Some laudable provisions in the National Industrial Court Rules 2007 include the provision of Order 5 which gives the court power to waive any of the rules in the interest of justice. This is

---

<sup>1</sup> Bimbo Atilola ed. 2008. Annotated Nigerian Labour Legislation, pp.173-174 of NICA 2006