

# GENDER IMPACTS OF SMALL-SCALE FARM HOUSEHOLDS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIALISATION IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

**Adenegan Kemisola O.** [bumkem@yahoo.com](mailto:bumkem@yahoo.com) Phone: +2348033717009

**Adams O.**

**Nwauwa L.O.E.** [linusezealaji@yahoo.com](mailto:linusezealaji@yahoo.com) Phone: +2347063633502

*Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.*

## Abstract

*Commercialization of subsistence agriculture in developing countries has led to different levels of production and consumption changes for men and women. This study therefore investigated the gender impacts of farm household resource allocation on agricultural commercialization in Nigeria. Results revealed that majority of the household heads were male (65%) with an average age of 47 years. 96% were married, 2% were single, 2% were divorced with an average household size of 6 members. Majority of the farmers operated on a small scale level. The linear regression result showed that farm size, income, land tenure, food security, level of education in relation to gender factor were variables that had impact on agricultural commercialization at 1%, 5%, 10% and levels of significance respectively. Food security and labor cost had a negative relationship with agricultural commercialization. The study recommends improvement of price policy and farm income through provision of subsidies to farmers.*

**Key Words:** *Market Participation, farmers, market, Marketable surplus, Commercialization and Nigeria.*

## Introduction

The fact that commercialization of subsistence agriculture in developing countries leads to different production and consumption changes for men and women has been well established for at least two decades. The productive contributions and constraints of African women farmers were largely ignored in the development policies, programs, and projects that effectively restructured small-scale commercial agriculture during the open-market or planned-economy modernization drives of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s (Hamilton, et al, 1998). Women were largely excluded from public land reform programs that enabled small-scale producers to own or use lands formerly held by less productive large estates (Deere 1986). State and donor-funded programs designed to increase commercial output in the smallholding sector channeled technology, credit, and marketing assistance to men, while women's programs focused on homemaking and supplemental income-earning activities (Flora and Santos 1986). Agricultural commercialization serves as a means of correcting external payment imbalances caused largely by secular declines in the per capita food production and the concomitant reductions in marketed food surpluses and improvement of the economic growth and development (Goetz, 1992, Rahji 2007).

In Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and South and Central America, small scale agriculture remains the major source of rural employment but, confronted with changes in world trade and falling commodity prices (Junior, 2006). Although, previous studies attributed the low market participation to different challenges, there is seldom any framework for ranking the impediment at village level and as a result, privatization and adaptation of intervention becomes difficult. Consequently, there is duplication of efforts and resource wastage, leading to a rise in food insecurity and widespread poverty (Balint, 2003). Improvements in market participation are necessary to link smallholder farmers to markets in order to increase agricultural production as well as set opportunities for income generation (Pingali, 1997). Enhancing the ability of smallholder and resource-poor farmers to access market opportunities and diversify their links with markets is one of the most pressing developmental challenges facing both governments and non-governmental organizations (IFAD, 2002). Market orientation enhances consumers' purchasing power for food, while enabling re-allocation of household income by producers to high value non-food agribusiness sectors and off farm enterprises (Davis, 2006). The rationale for enhancing participation in commercial agriculture also stem from the potentials to accelerate

attainment of the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) on food security and poverty reduction through utilization of untapped opportunities in commodity value chains (John et al, 2007).

A review of studies on how agricultural innovation affects women shows mixed results, depending on the type of technology introduced (Von Braun, et al, 1989). Projects that have incorporated time saving technology (for example, pumps, carts) as part of farm commercialization have benefited women, who have used the time saved to engage in, for example, income-generating activities. Also, a disproportionate increase in women's work as a result of commercialization may occur only for the poorest farm households or only until households achieve a level of production and income that allows them to hire extra labor (von Braun 1989). Closely related to the increased time women spend in agriculture is the concern that women lose control of the products of their labor during commercialization. The introduction of cash crops has traditionally increased the economic status of men, while decreasing the autonomy of women, largely because it has been primarily men who have received the training and the new technologies. A focus on training men in the production of introduced cash crops, for which they controlled the income earned, has left women farmers insufficient time to continue their traditional income-earning activities, for which they controlled the income earned (for example, local marketing). Commercialization can also undermine women's traditional control over certain agricultural crops. A project in The Gambia which introduced a new irrigation system for rice production transformed rice from a "woman's crop" to a male-controlled crop (von Braun et al, 1989). Failure to consider gender roles in income generation and control can lead to project failure. A pyrethrum project in Kenya, which sought to organize a co-operative society to generate income from the sale of the flowers (used in pesticides), failed when women reduced their participation to protest the fact that men were the only ones who received payment (Warren, et al, 1991).

For women and their families, the household and individual health and nutrition consequences of commercialization are related changes in time and income. Traditionally, women have been the ones who allocated household income for food, child care, health, and to a certain extent, education. When women lose control over income -as it increasingly becomes cash income from food cropping-they have less income under their direct control for food, health, and other household essentials. An example of this is an irrigated rice project in Kenya in which the earnings from the crop were given only to the men. As a result, household incomes

90 rose but nutritional levels fell because the women were dependent on their husbands for  
91 expenditures (Suda, 1996). It has been observed that daily standard of living and nutritional  
92 levels depend more on women, who earn small, steady incomes which they tend to spend on  
93 small, regular purchases of food.

94 Social and demographic changes worldwide are resulting in women heading more  
95 households and being the principal decision-makers. From a policy and program perspective, it  
96 has long been recognized that female-headed households are different than male or joint-headed  
97 households (Von Braun, et al, 1989). Some attentions have been given to the impact of off-farm  
98 work of male farmers on agricultural commercialization. Brown(2008) provided support for the  
99 hypothesis by Smith(2002) that a greater involvement in off-farm labor markets of farmers  
100 decreases on-farm efficiency which will later affect agricultural commercialization. Brown  
101 (2008) further explored the extent to which farmers participate in off-farm work changes  
102 intensity on fertilizer and crop protection use. According to Von Braun, et al, (1989), the  
103 opportunity cost of males farming effort is high. This has significant socio-cultural and economic  
104 implications, including changes in patterns of gender relationships within household and the  
105 community in general, problem of inequality of decisions on gender basis in the process of  
106 allocating scarce resources on the farm to boost marketable surpluses, low growth of marketable  
107 surplus and marketing problem, problem of the food quality control, mal-nutrition and disease in  
108 children. The shift has different costs and benefits for men and women farmers according to local  
109 context-related factors.

110 The study therefore identifies gender related factors and their impacts on  
111 commercialization by small-holders in Nigeria. In view of the above, the following questions  
112 seem pertinent to the study:

- 113 • What are the patterns of socio-economic characteristics of the study area?
- 114 • What are the impacts of gender allocation of household resources on agricultural  
115 commercialization?
- 116 • Which resource(s) on gender basis can impact more on agricultural commercialization  
117 of the small scale farmers, in what direction and how can they be selected?

## Hypothesis

The under mentioned hypothesis was formulated and tested for the study:

H<sub>0</sub>: Gender related factors impact on agricultural commercialization of small holder farm households is negative in Osun state, Nigeria.

## METHODOLOGY



### Study Area

Ido Local Government Area is one of the 26 Local Government Councils in Oyo state Nigeria. It has extensive fertile soil which is suitable for agriculture. The basic occupation of the people is farming. There are pockets of grass land which are suitable for animal rearing, vast forest reserves and rivers. The people grow a variety of crops such as cocoa, Kola nut, Palm oil, Oranges, Pineapple, Plantain, Maize, Cassava, Banana, Mango and other wide range fruit. Also, vegetables such as tomatoes, Okro, Ewedu(*Chochorusolitorus*) and other wide vegetable are grown. Ido Local Government can be aptly referred to as the food basket of the state. Apart from farming, the Local Government has also gained tremendously from industrialization process. Industries such as the Nigeria wire and Cable Industries Limited, Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) and Nigeria Mining Corporation, NMC, manufacturer of burnt bricks are all located in the local Council. The area also enjoys the services of medium and small scale industries for processing agricultural products like cassava and cashew nuts.

### Data and Data Collection

Both primary and secondary data were used for this study. The primary data were collected through the use of well-structured questionnaire. Variables considered in the construction of and structuring of the questionnaire were age of the respondents, sex, marital status, family size, amount of time spent on the farm and years of experience, income realized, occupation (both primary and secondary), etc. Secondary information was sourced from journals and other relevant literatures.

### Sampling Technique

The study population comprised small-holder farmers who are residents of the study area. Stratified random sampling technique was used in selecting the respondents. The wards in the local government were stratified into ten with a total of 100 questionnaires distributed equally among the strata. The stratification was done based on the richness of the soils in the local

government, as some parts of the local government make use of fertilizer to support the growth of their crops, some other parts do not use fertilizers yet their output is still as much as those using fertilizers. All the 100 questionnaires shared equally in the Local Government Area were all retrieved.

### **Analytical Techniques**

The data obtained for this study will be analyzed by using frequency table, mean values, percentages and linear regression model to present the results. Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were employed to ensure valid and reliable inference. Linear regression model was used to show the effect of all the determinants on agricultural commercialization relating to gender factors.

### **Model Specification**

The aim of the study was to identify gender related factors and their impacts on commercialization by small-holders. Ideally, the ordinary least square (OLS) model is applicable when all households participate in the market but in reality not all households participate or at the same level in the markets. Some households may not prefer to participate in a particular market in favor of another, while others may be excluded by market conditions. If the OLS regression is estimated excluding the non-participants from the analysis, a sample selectivity bias is introduced into the model. Such a problem is overcome by following a two-stage procedure as suggested by Heckman (1979) or Tobit procedures. These procedures have been discussed broadly in Tobin (1958), Greene (1993), Maddala, (1988), and Gujarati (1995) and applied in several instances such as Adejobi et al (2006). Both Heckit and Tobit procedures also addressed this concern. The Heckit procedure is a consistent but not an efficient way to control for selectivity bias, while Tobit procedure is efficient and consistent.

Technically, if Heckit specification was run using Maximum likelihood Estimation (MLE) procedure without lambda, the results would be identical to Tobit-MLE selection models with iterations constrained to one. The results obtainable from the Tobit procedure are the MLE or maximum likelihood estimates, as well as the marginal effects. The marginal effects indicate the amount of the sales resulting from a unit change in the explanatory variables. The marginal effects account for the probability of the level of market participation. They have the same interpretation as the OLS coefficients. It is sometimes pertinent to compare the marginal effects

and OLS coefficients, though the latter are distorted. Data providing for market participation tend to be censored at the lower limit of zero. That is, the household may sell some of its produce, while another may not sell at all. If only probability of selling is to be analyzed, Probit or Logit models would be adequate techniques for addressing probability questions. Although it is interesting to know factors that influence the level of sales, at the same time, there is a need for a model that is a hybrid between the Logit or Probit and the OLS.

The model postulates that the probability ( $P_i$ ) that a farm household commercializes its crop production is a linear function of all the explanatory variables,  $X_i$ .

$$P_i(Y) = F(X_i) \quad \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

$$X_i = X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, \dots\dots\dots, X_{15} \quad \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

The explanatory variables,  $X_i$ 's, in addition to the linear property, also summarize a set of the farm, market, demographic, individuals and household characteristics.  $X_i$ 's variables are related to gender resource and time allocation within the household.

$$Y = b_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots\dots + \beta_n X_n \quad \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

The probability of commercialization is given by

$$P_i(Y=1) \quad \dots\dots\dots (4)$$

Non-commercialization probability is

$$Q_i(Y=0) \quad \dots\dots\dots (5)$$

Where ( $P_i$  = Probability of farm household commercializing)  $P_i(Y=1)$

$Q_i(Y=0)$  (Probability of farm household not commercializing).

$Y$  = Dependent variable which is dummy; if farm household commercializes,  $Y=1$  and if otherwise,  $Y=0$ .

$X_1$  = Household income in Naira



$X_2$  = Land size in hectares

$X_3$  = Land tenure (Dummy variable), if owned = 1, otherwise = 0

$X_4$  = Male off farm time in hours

$X_5$  = Female off farm time in hours

206  $X_6$  = Male farm time in hours

207  $X_7$  = Female farm time in hours

208  $X_8$  = Farm household size

209  $X_9$  = Male education in years

210  $X_{10}$  = Female education in years

211  $X_{11}$  = Cost of hired farm labor in Naira

212  $X_{12}$  = Cost of purchased farm inputs in Naira

213  $X_{13}$  = Livestock owned (Dummy), if owned=1 and if not =0.

214  $X_{14}$  = Experience of farmers in years

215  $X_{15}$  = Food security of farm household in Naira

216  $U_i$  = Error term.

217  $Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7 + b_8X_8 + b_9X_9 + b_{10}X_{10} + b_{11}X_{11} + b_{12}X_{12} + b_{13}X_{13} + b_{14}$

218  $X_{14} + b_{15}X_{15} + U_i$

## 219 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**



### 220 **Socio-economic Characteristics of Farming Households.**

221 The Socio-economic characteristics of the farming households include age, household  
222 size, level of education, gender, marital status, and farm size among others. Table 1 describes the  
223 socio-economic characteristics of farming households. Most of the respondents were within the  
224 age group of 46-55 with (about 31%) while very few were within the age group 66-76 (7%). This  
225 revealed that the average of the respondents is 47.1 years. The implication of this finding was  
226 that most of the respondents were at their middle age which means that they were still active in  
227 their farm production activities. They have accumulated enough experience for farm production  
228 over the years. The farmer's strength and energy were still highly productive, which affected  
229 their farm activities positively as opined by Markhura (2000). The farmers' age is an important  
230 factor in influencing their level of farm output especially in peasant farming which is

characterized by high labor requirements. The older farmers about 7% are gradually giving way for the young and enterprising young ones who take the job as business. According to Randela et al, 2008, older farmers view farming as a way of life rather than as a business and have a strong emotional or almost biological connection with farming, land and little or no contact with the outside world. For farmers producing on a larger scale, their active period fell within the most productive age group which thereby favored high marketable surplus growth (i.e. agricultural commercialization).

Male

participation in agricultural production in the study area was greater than that of the female with 65% of the respondents being male while 35% were female. This might be due to the fact that females do more of the marketing than the males, or the females do engage more in the house chore works. Most of the females that responded as farmers have small farm holdings giving to them by their husband or inherited the land to practice subsistence farming. The implication of this is that land resource is poorly secured on gender basis which might have a negative impact on agricultural commercialization due to the decision taken in committing it into use. Von Braun (1995) opined that some of the worst apparent failure of agricultural commercialization cited in the literatures, such as the eviction of farmer-tenants can be traced mainly to the poorly defined land rights on gender basis rather than to the process of commercialization. This is clearly observed and supported by this study. 96% of the respondents were married, 2 % were single and 2 % also were divorced. The implication of this finding was that most of the farmers were married, therefore used members of the family as labor. This act increased their productivity to favor high marketable surplus (agricultural commercialization) and to reduce their labor costs. Being married determined the capability of the farm households to allocate all their resources efficiently on both farm and non-farm activities to boost the household income.

 Average household size was 6 persons per household. The household size is a crucial determinant of the available labor for the farming activities especially in the sub-Saharan Africa, which is predominantly family labor dependent, and labor intensive at the subsistence level. Larger households with more dependants are likely to have a lower level of commercialization as confirmed by  et al (2003) that propensity to commercialize decline with number of household members. This is because more of the farm produce is likely to be allocated for home consumption rather than the market. Most of the farmers were literate with 48% attending primary school, 23% attending secondary school and

only 5% had tertiary education. On the other hand, only 24% had no formal education at all. This result had a great effect on the level of diversification of farmers to minimize risk, generate more income and increase their production volume to favor agricultural commercialization .Due to their high level of literacy; the adoption rate of the farmers in the study area in terms of engaging in other activities apart from farming was high.

### Regression Analysis Results

The linear regression technique was employed to estimate the impact of the gender related factors on the agricultural commercialization. The dependent variable Y (agricultural commercialization) and the independent variables  $X_1$ - $X_{15}$  were used for the analysis. The results of the analysis were presented in the table 2. The coefficient of determination of the linear regression was 0.768 with an adjusted value of the coefficient of determination of 0.760. This implied that about 76.80% of the variability in the agricultural commercialization was explained by different variables used in the model. The F-ratio was significant at 10 % implying that the whole model was fitted. Gross income ( $X_1$ ) was significant at 5% and negative which means that the higher Gross income realized, the lower the commercialization of agriculture by 70.9%. It also implied that farmers that realized more of the Gross income tended to produce little agricultural produce since more time was allocated to the off-farm activities as reflected by the results of the analysis and thereby reduced the market allocation which reduced involvement in agricultural commercialization. Farm size ( $X_2$ ) was also significant at 1% and positive, indicating that a further increase in the farm size would increase output which would in turn encourage agricultural commercialization by 73.9%. Farmers with large expanse of land would plant more crops and the allocation to the market would increase, leading to high agricultural commercialization.  $X_3$  (land ownership), was also found to be significant at 10 % and positively related to the agricultural commercialization. This implied that as the Land ownership increased by 1%, the agricultural commercialization increased by 20.6 %. It might be inferred from this result that as farmers tended to commit their owned land for agricultural purpose, there would be an increase in the farm products which would lead to increase in agricultural commercialization.  $X_9$  (level of education) had a positive relationship with agricultural commercialization and was significant at 10%. An increase in the level of education by 1% would lead to a 26.4% increase in the agricultural commercialization.  $X_{15}$  (food security) had a negative relationship with agricultural commercialization and significant at 10%. An increase in the food security by 1%

would lead to a decrease in the agricultural commercialization by 20.7%. This is due to the fact that the peoples' home allocation of the farm produce would increase and the market allocation would decrease leading to the decrease in the agricultural commercialization

## Conclusion

This study approached the issues of the farm household's scarce resources allocation between the male and the female, issues of the allocation of the total farm outputs into the home consumption and the marketable surplus. Major crops grown in the area were cassava, maize, cocoyam, yam, banana, plantain, pineapple, orange, vegetables (okra, amaranthus, *Corchorusolitorus*, celosia, tomatoes, and pepper.). All the farmers made use of both hired labor and the family labor. The linear regression result concludes that farm size, income, land tenure, food security, level of education in relation to gender factor were the variables that had impact on the agricultural commercialization and they were at 1 %, 5 % and 10% levels of significance respectively. The study established that gender impacts on the farm household's resource allocation on the agricultural commercialization of food crops in Ido Local Government Area of Oyo state, Nigeria. The marketable surplus of the farm households reflected their market orientation through the impact of the gender related variables on the co-efficient of the agricultural commercialization. The result generated through this study had policy implications on the home consumption, marketable surplus allocation and the co-efficient agricultural commercialization of the farming households in the study area.

## Recommendations

Since most of respondents were small  scale farmers, land expansion policy should be encouraged to make agricultural land available for the farm households. This would have a positive impact on agricultural commercialization and help increase their scale of production and economies of scale. Also improvement of farm income through provision of subsidies to the farmers and price policy targeted to reduce farm inputs price and increase farm outputs price to enhance increased gross farm income should be vigorously pursued.

## REFERENCES



- Adejobi A, Amaza P, and G Ayoola.2006. “Enhancing the access of rural households to output markets for increased farm income”. Poster paper prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economics Conference ,Gold -coast Australia, August.
- Balint, P.K .2003“Land, Labor and Rural Poverty; Essays in Developing Economics”. Delhi; Oxford University Press.
- Brown, L. 2008. “Women Make Income Gains by Shifting from Subsistence to Cash Crops”Development Outreach, World Bank Institute, 1818 H Street NW,
- Davis J. R.2006“How can the poor benefit from the growing markets for high value agricultural product”. Research report, Natural Resources Institute Kent. UK
- Deere, C. D. 1986“Rural Women and Agrarian Reform in Peru, Chile, and Cuba”. A Doctoral Dissertation.Department of Anthropology, Michigan state University.
- Flora, C. B. and Santos B. 1986 “Women in Farming Systems in Latin America. In Women and Change in Latin America”. June Nash and Helen Safa, eds. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.
- Greene, W.H, (1993) “Econometric Analysis”. Macmillan, New York
- Gujarati D.N. 1995“Basic Econometrics”, New York; McGraw.Hill. 3rd Edition
- Goetz S.J. 1992“A selectivity model of Household. Food marketing behavior in Sub-Sahara Africa” .*America Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 74 (2); 444-452.
- Hamilton, S., Asturias L, andTevalanB. 1998.“The Myth of the Masculine Market: Gender and Agricultural Commercialization in the Ecuadorean Andes”. Anita Spring, ed. Lynne Rienner Publishers. Pp. 65-87
- Heckman,J.J (1979).“Sample selection Bias as a Specification Error”.*Econometrica*, 47; 931-59.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development,IFAD 2002“Rural Poverty report: The challenges of ending rural poverty Rome, Italy (IFAD). [www.ifad.org/poverty.index.htm](http://www.ifad.org/poverty.index.htm) (Accessed 03/04/2009)

352 John O, David Otiemo, Ellen McCullough and Timothy Njaanamba. 2007 "Strategies to  
 353 promote market oriented smallholder Agricultural in Developing countries. A case of  
 354 Kenya". AEE Conference Proceedings. (2007) 259- 264.

355 Junior R..D. 2006 How can the poor benefit from the growing markets for high value  
 356 agricultural product", Research report. Natural Resources institute Kent. U.K.

357 Lapar, M. L., Holloway, G & Ehui, S, 2003. "Policy options promoting market participation  
 358 among smallholder livestock producers: A case study from the Philippines". *Food*  
 359 *Policy* 28, 187– 211.

360 Maddala, G. S. 1988. "Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics". New  
 361 York: Cambridge University Press.

362 Makhura, M.T. 2001 "Transaction costs and Smallholder participation in Maize market in the  
 363 Northern province of the South Africa". International Food Policy Research  
 364 Institute, Washington D.C ,USA.

365 Pingali P. L. 1997 "From subsistence to commercial production systems. The transformation of  
 366 Asian Agriculture". *American journal of Agricultural Economics*. 79(2). 628-634

367 Von Braun, J. and E. Webb. 1989 "Agricultural commercialization and economic development in  
 368 India". *Journal of Asian Economics* 15: 461 – 479.

369 Von Braun, Joachim, David Hotchkiss, and Maarten Immink. 1989 "Non-traditional Export  
 370 Crops in Guatemala: Effects on Production, Income and Nutrition". Research Report 73.  
 371 Washington, D.C.: IFPRI.

372 Von Braun, J. 1995 "Agricultural Commercialization, Economic Development and  
 373 Nutrition". Baltimore M.D. USA. The Hopkins University Press.

374  Von Braun, Joachim, David Hotchkiss, and Maarten Immink 1989. "Non-traditional Export  
 375 Crops in Guatemala: Effects on Production, Income, and Nutrition". Research Report  
 376 73. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI.

377  Rha. A.Y. 2007 "Gender impacts of farm household resource allocation on agricultural  
 378 commercialization in Oyo state, Nigeria. Asset series c (2007) 2 (1): 1-15

379 Randela R, Alemu Z.G and Groenewald J.A (2008); "Factors Enhancing market participation  
 380 by small scale farmers. *Agrekon*, 47 (4) December.

381 Suda .C.A. 1996 "Household Labor Use and Changes in Gender Roles on Small Farms in  
 382 Ndhwa Division, Kenya Monograph" Series No. 1 Winrock International. USA.

Tobin, J 1958“Estimation of relationship for limited independent variables”. *Econometrica*26,  
(24-36)

Warren, Kay B. and Susan C. Bourque. 1991 “Women, Technology, and International  
Development Ideologies: Analyzing Feminist Voices. In *Gender at the Crossroads:  
Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*”. Micaela di Leonardo, ed. Berkeley:  
University of California Press. pp. 278-311

## APPENDIX

**Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Farming Households**



| <b>A. Age Distribution of Respondents</b>    |                  |                   |                              |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Category</b>                              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> | <b>Cumulative percentage</b> |
| <b>26 – 35</b>                               | <b>19</b>        | <b>19</b>         | <b>19</b>                    |
| <b>36-45</b>                                 | <b>26</b>        | <b>26</b>         | <b>45</b>                    |
| <b>46-55</b>                                 | <b>31</b>        | <b>31</b>         | <b>76</b>                    |
| <b>56-65</b>                                 | <b>17</b>        | <b>17</b>         | <b>93</b>                    |
| <b>66- - 75</b>                              | <b>7</b>         | <b>7</b>          | <b>100</b>                   |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>100</b>       | <b>100</b>        |                              |
| <b>B. Gender Distribution of respondents</b> |                  |                   |                              |
| <b>Female</b>                                | <b>35</b>        | <b>35</b>         | <b>35</b>                    |
| <b>Male</b>                                  | <b>65</b>        | <b>65</b>         | <b>100</b>                   |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>100</b>       | <b>100</b>        |                              |
| <b>C. Marital Status of Respondents</b>      |                  |                   |                              |
| <b>Married</b>                               | <b>96</b>        | <b>96</b>         | <b>96</b>                    |
| <b>Single</b>                                | <b>2</b>         | <b>2</b>          | <b>98</b>                    |
| <b>Divorced</b>                              | <b>2</b>         | <b>2</b>          | <b>100</b>                   |
| <b>D. Household Size of Respondents</b>      |                  |                   |                              |
| <b>1-3</b>                                   | <b>6</b>         | <b>6</b>          | <b>6</b>                     |
| <b>4-6</b>                                   | <b>80</b>        | <b>80</b>         | <b>86</b>                    |
| <b>7-9</b>                                   | <b>12</b>        | <b>12</b>         | <b>98</b>                    |
| <b>&gt;9</b>                                 | <b>2</b>         | <b>2</b>          | <b>100</b>                   |
| <b>E. Educational Level of Respondents</b>   |                  |                   |                              |
| <b>None</b>                                  | <b>24</b>        | <b>24</b>         | <b>24</b>                    |
| <b>6</b>                                     | <b>48</b>        | <b>48</b>         | <b>72</b>                    |
| <b>12</b>                                    | <b>23</b>        | <b>23</b>         | <b>95</b>                    |
| <b>16</b>                                    | <b>5</b>         | <b>5</b>          | <b>100</b>                   |

**Source: Field survey, 2010**

**Table 2: Regression Analysis Results.**

**Coefficients**

| Model                               | None standardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        | Sig.    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|---------|
|                                     | Beta                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | B      |         |
| Constant                            | .960                           | .245       |                           | 3.922  | .000    |
| Family size                         | .028                           | .025       | -.136                     | -1.108 | .271    |
| Farming Exp.(years)                 | 8.416E-6                       | .003       | .000                      | .003   | .998    |
| Farm size(ha)                       | .286                           | .077       | .739                      | 3.725  | .000*   |
| Gross income (₦)                    | -5.431E-7                      | .000       | -.709                     | -2.235 | .028**  |
| Land ownership                      | .134                           | .070       | .206                      | 1.924  | .058*** |
| Livestock owned                     | -.126                          | .085       | -.154                     | -1.474 | .144    |
| Labor cost(₦)                       | -5.735E-7                      | .000       | -.125                     | -.210  | .834    |
| Cost of inputs (₦)                  | 9.609E-7                       | .000       | .350                      | .492   | .624    |
| Food security(₦)                    | -1.349E-6                      | .000       | -.207                     | -1.713 | .090*** |
| Male off farm time per year (hrs)   | 1.027E-5                       | .000       | .031                      | .146   | .885    |
| Female off farm time per year (hrs) | 3.193E-5                       | .000       | .095                      | .440   | .661    |
| Male farm time per year (hrs)       | -3.853E-5                      | .000       | -.128                     | -.527  | .599    |
| Female farm time per year (hrs)     | -3.589E-5                      | .000       | -.085                     | -.319  | .751    |
| Level of education (yrs)            | .016                           | .009       | .264                      | 1.845  | .069*** |
| F                                   |                                |            | 1.572                     |        | .09     |
| R <sup>2</sup> = 0.768              |                                |            |                           |        |         |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = 0.76      |                                |            |                           |        |         |

**Source: Field Survey, 2011**

\*significant at 1% , \*\*significant at 5% and \*\*\*significant at 10%

432  
433  
434

UNDER PEER REVIEW