

**ASSESSMENT OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF MALE FARMERS IN NON FARM INCOME
GENERATING ACTIVITIES IN OGO-OLUWA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OYO-STATE**

¹Taiwo, A. O. and F. A. ²Kuponiyi

¹Dept. of Agricultural Technology, Oyo State College of Agriculture, Igboora.

²Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, LAUTECH, Ogbomoso

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the involvement of male farmers in non-farm Income Generating Activities (IGAs) in Ogo-Oluwa Local Government Area of Oyo state. Multistage sampling technique was used to select 100 respondents for the study. A well-structured and validated interview schedule was used in collecting primary data. The data were then subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistics. The respondents were involved in non-farm income generating activities such as trading (29%), driving (7%), Okada riding (6%), mechanics (6%), Carpentry (5%), Milling (5%) and others (18%). Contributions to family welfare were scored in the areas of feeding, children's education, family health care and social obligations. The result further revealed that none of the male farmer's personal characteristics such as age, marital status, educational level, religion and cosmopolitaness influenced their involvement in non-farm IGAs. Therefore there is a need to encourage farmers to get involved in non-farm IGAs coupled with farming so as to complement for declining returns in farming.

Key words: Involvement, non-farm IGA(s), diversification, male farmers.

INTRODUCTION

In Nigeria, agriculture is the mainstay of the rural economy with most small scale farmers still operating with the use of traditional implements and lacking appropriate technology. Ajakaye and Adeyeye (2001) stated that incidence of poverty in Nigeria has remained a great problem especially among rural households who rely mainly on farm income. This makes the rural poor to diversify into other income generating activities outside farming. Diversification has been defined by Ellis (2000) as the process by which rural household construct an increasing diverse portfolio of activities and assets in other to survive and improve their standard of living. It also helps in the generation of additional source of income for the farm families to substitute for the declining returns from farming. Ekong (2003) highlighted that occupations in rural area are not solely farm oriented; they include various forms of secondary or industrial occupations in the areas of weaving, carving, leather work, carpentry,

bicycle repair, beer parlour operation, teaching, transport business etc.

However, non-farm income is the monetary benefit derived from out-of-farm economic activities (Ranish and Stewart 2002). It creates an avenue for rural household to improve their standard of living. Freeman and Ellis (2005) opined that non-farm income generating activities have positive correlation with financial savings, social contacts, education, and even local capacity building opportunities among the rural poor in Africa because they are exposed to outside communities. Income generated from farm activities (small scale) has been described as too little for meaningful savings and re-investment that will lead to high yield and food security (Nwaru, 2004). Therefore, there is need for involvement in non-farm income generating activities which will serve as a substitute for farm income discrepancy among the rural households. Alimba (1995) confirmed this assertion in a study conducted in some rural communities of Eastern Nigeria that

non-farm income has been found to sustain employment and income, provides seasonal occupation for farm workers during less busy times of the year, contribute to poverty alleviation by increasing income of the poor and non-farm activities thereby contributing to the dynamics and equitable growth cycle. It was also asserted by Haggblade et al. (2002) that non-farm income accounts for 40% of rural income in Africa. Different studies have reported an increasing share of non-farm income in total household income: (Haggblade et al, 2007; de Janvry and Sadoulet, 2001; Ruben and van de Bercy, 2001). Definitely, involvement of farmers in non-farm income generating activities has dwindled the fortunes of agriculture and this is a source of concern in the country like ours where food insecurity is being experienced. Based on this background the objectives of this study are to determine the personal characteristics of the male farmers, identify the non-farm income generating activities of the farmers in the study area, investigate why the farmers are involved in non-farm income generating activities, and to investigate the contributions of non-farm income generating activities to the improvement of family welfare of the male farmers.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Ogo-Oluwa Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Ogo-Oluwa local government area is approximately on 4°15' East longitude and 8°07' North latitude. The local government headquarters is Ajaawa. Ajaawa community is situated on the derived savanna zone with tall grasses being the predominant vegetation. The population of study consisted of the male farmers involved in both farm and non-farm income generating activities in Ogo-Oluwa local government area of Oyo State. Ogo-Oluwa local government consists of ten (10) wards. Five (5)

wards were selected through a random sampling technique, balloting was used to select two (2) villages in each ward from the list of villages obtained at the local government secretariat. From each of the five (5) wards, ten (10) respondents from each village were randomly selected to obtain a total sample of 100 respondents for the study.

The data for the study was collected with the aid of a well structured and validated interview schedule administered on the respondents.

Measurement of variable

Contribution to household welfare

The respondents were asked to mention the ways they spent money realized from their non-farm IGA(s) grouped under 3 headings as follows:

(a) Children's education:

Respondents indicated personal contribution to the children's school fees, uniform, books, feeding at school etc. as a percentage of the cost actually contributed by the family.

(b) Family feeding:

Quantity of food actually taken per week: percentage of the cost actually contributed by the family.

(c) Social obligation:

Respondents indicated specific contributions to clothing for the children and other dependants, anniversaries, burials, weddings etc. that involves the family members monthly.

(d) Health care:

Respondents indicated percentage contributions to the costs of health care of the family members monthly.

Descriptive statistics used to present data involving socio-economic characteristics of the respondents were frequencies, percentages and mean. Chi-square was used to test the hypothesis. This was employed to investigate which of the selected socio-economic characteristics significantly influenced the level of involvement of the

respondents in non-farm income generating activities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personal characteristics of the respondents

Age -Findings in Table 1 show that 32.0% of the male farmers interviewed were aged between 41 and 50 years while 30.0% were aged between 30 and 40 years. 14.0% each were aged 51-60 years and over 60 years, respectively. The mean age of the respondents was 44 years.

Marital Status - Table 1 also indicates that majority (89.0%) of the male farmers interviewed were married, 10.0% were single and about 1.0% were widowed. The high percentage of married people is an indication of more responsible adults who have to cater for their family needs through means other than farming in the study area. Tologbonse and Adekunle (2000) opined in their study that majority of the rural adults are married.

Marriage Pattern– The data from Table 1 also revealed that more than half (63.0%) of the sampled respondents indicated that their marriage pattern was one man-one wife (Monogamy) while about 24.0% indicated their marriage pattern as being polygamous.

Religion– Majority (93.0%) of the respondents were Christians while 7.0% of them practiced Islamic religion. This reveals that the respondents are predominantly Christians.

Educational Background – In this study, only 40.0% of the respondents had primary education, 30.0% of them also had secondary education while 26.0% had no formal education. Only 4.0% had tertiary education. The level of literacy was high with 70.0% of the respondents being literate. This implies that the level of education could have aided their involvement in non-farm income generating activities.

Formal organisation membership – The data in Table 1 also reveals that 45.0% belonged to cooperative societies, 24.0% were in socio-cultural groups while 10.0% were in professional groups. This implies that membership in a cooperative group could enable the male farmers obtain loan necessary for non-farm income generating activities.

Cosmopolitaness: Table 1 also indicates how often the male farmers visited other places outside their community. About 67.0% visited on weekly basis and 17.0% fortnightly while 2.0% visited rarely. This shows that more than half of the male farmers visited other places weekly; hence their frequent interaction with other people outside their community may change their perspective about farming solely, thus facilitating their decision about involvement in non-farm income generating activities to augment family income.

Number of Children - From Table 1, it is evident that 15.0% of the respondent had above 4 children while 36.0% of them having a total number of children ranging from 1 to 4.

Table1: Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
<30	10	10.0
30-40	30	30.0
41-50	32	32.0
51-60	14	14.0
>60	14	14.0
(Mean Age= 44)		
Marital Status		
Single	10	10.0
Married	89	89.0
Widowed	1	1.0
Marriage Pattern		
Monogamy	63	63.0
Polygamy	24	24.0
No Response	13	13.0
Religion		
Christianity	93	93.0
Islamic	7	7.0
Educational Background		

No Formal Education	26	26.0
Primary Education	40	40.0
Secondary Education	30	30.0
Tertiary	4	4.0
Formal Organisation Membership	21	21.0
Cooperative	45	45.0
Socio-cultural	24	24.0
Professional	10	10.0
No response	21	21.0
Cosmopolitaness		
Weekly	67	67.0
Fortnightly	17	17.0
Rarely	2	2.0
No response	2	2.0
Number of Children		
1-4	15	15.0
>4	36	36.0
No response	49	49.0

Source: field survey, 2012

Types of non-farm income generating activities

Table 2 reveals the types of Non-farm IGAs in the study area. The most common non-farm income generating activity was trading (29.0%) while schooling recorded the least percentage. This supports the findings of Adisa and Adekunle (2007) who reported that trading and commerce was the most common non-farm activities in a similar study conducted in Kwara state.

Table 2: Distributions of respondents by types of non-farm income generating activities

Non- Farm Income activities	Frequency	Percentage
Trading	29	29.0
Milling	5	5.0
Mechanic	6	6.0
Driving	7	7.0
Carpenter	5	5.0
Motorcycle riding (okada)	6	6.0
Others	18	18.0
None	24	24.0

Source: Field survey, 2012

Reasons for involvement in non-farm income generating activities

The findings from Table 3 indicate that 29.0% of the respondents depended mainly only on farming. Some others who engaged in non-farm income generating activities outside farming claimed that income generated from farming alone was not encouraging (41.0%), Lack of capital (16.0%) to invest further in agriculture, Seasonal fluctuation (7.0%) and Drudgery (7.0%). This implies that income from farming only was not sufficient to meet the needs of the family as well as other social obligations.

Table 3: Reasons for involvement in non-farm income generating activities n=100

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Dependent only on Farming	29	29.0
Income from Farming not Encouraging	41	41.0
Drudgery	7	7.0
Seasonal Fluctuation	7	7.0
Lack of Capital	16	16.0

Source: Field survey, 2012

Contributions of respondents to family welfare

Table 4 reveals areas of contribution considered in this study which are family feeding, education of children, social obligation, and family health care. Data in Table 4 shows that 15.0% contributed 10% on family feeding while 46.0% contributed nothing; 13.0% contributed above 50% expenses on feeding while 7.0% each contributed 30% and 40%, respectively. This shows that most of the male farmers contributed mostly to family feeding in the study area.

Also, the table below shows that 16.0% of the respondent contributed above 50% of their expenditure on children's education while 47.0% contributed nothing. It further shows 12.0% contributed 10% to their children education while 10.0% contributed 20%. This shows that the male

farmers contributed to children’s education thereby showing the value placed on education of children.

Table 4 further reveals that 32.0% of the respondents contributed 10% of the expenditure on family healthcare while 45.0% contributed nothing. It was also shown that 15.0% contributed 20% while 5.0% contributed 30%. This indicates the importance one third of the respondents placed on the health care of the family member.

Data in Table 4 also show that in all, 31% contributed 10% expenses in performing social obligations while 49.0% contributed nothing. Also the result shows that 10.0% contributed 20% expenses on performing social obligations. This implies that one third of the respondents placed premium on responding to social obligations.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by their contribution to family welfare, n=100

Family Welfare	Frequency	Percentage
Family feeding (% of family expenses)		
10	15	15.0
20	12	12.0
30	7	7.0
40	7	7.0
Above 50	13	13.0
Nil	46	46.0
Children Education		
10	12	12.0
20	10	10.0
30	7	7.0
40	8	8.0
Above 50	16	16.0
Nil	47	47.0
Family Health Care		
10	32	32.0
20	15	15.0
30	5	5.0
40	1	1.0
Above 50	2	2.0
Nil	45	45.0
Social Obligation		
10	31	31.0
20	10	10.0
30	8	8.0
40	-	-
Above 50	2	2.0
Nil	49	49.0

Categorization of Respondents’ Contribution to Family Welfare

Data in Table 5 shows that the respondents’ contributions to family welfare were higher for Children education (\bar{x} =1.65) and Family feeding (\bar{x} =1.33) while social obligation (\bar{x} =0.85) and Family health care (\bar{x} =0.19) had lower weighted mean score respectively. This implies that Children’s education and Family feeding were of utmost priority for the farmers and this serves as the reason for their involvement in non-farm income generating activities in the study area.

Table 5: Categorization of respondents’ contribution to family welfare

Variables	Weighted Mean score
Children Education	1.65
Family Feeding	1.33
Social Obligation	0.85
Family Health Care	0.19

Source: Data analysis, 2012

Test of hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between selected personal characteristics of the farmers and their involvement in non-farm income generating activities.

Result of Chi-square Test

Table 6 shows the result of chi-square analysis of male farmers’ personal characteristics and their involvement in NFIGA. None of the male farmers’ personal characteristics such as age, marital status, education level, religion and cosmopolitaness had significant relationship with income generating activities. This implies that none of the personal characteristics of respondents influenced their involvement in non-farm IGA.

Table 6: Result of Chi-square

Characteristics	X ² Value	df	p-value	Decision
Marital Status	1.787	4	0.775	NS
Age Level of Education	11.657	8	0.167	NS
Religion	6.544	6	0.365	NS
Cosmopolitaness	0.140	2	0.932	NS
	9.862	8	0.275	NS

Source: Data analysis, 2012

NS: Not Significant

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The rural economy has been found to rely not only on income from farming alone but diversify to family non-farm income generating activities. The income realized from the non-farm IGA were utilised for improved standard of living, mostly in terms of caring for children’s education and family feeding, family health care etc. None of the personal characteristics of the findings influenced their income generating activities. Sequel to these findings, it is therefore recommended that income generating activities should be encouraged among farmers who are still involved in farming solely. However, it should not be at the expense of agricultural production and development.

REFERENCES

Adisa, R.S and Adekunle O.A. (2007). Information and communication Technology in non-agricultural Enterprises for Rural Transformation in Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of agriculture and Rural Development*. 9:16-21.

Ajakaye D.O. and V.A. Adeyeye (2001). The nature of poverty in Nigeria”. Nigerian institute of social and Economic research (NISER) Monograph series No 13, Nigeria.

Alimba, J.O. (1995). Linkage between farm and non-farm sector of the Nigerian Rural Economy. *Rural Development in Nigeria*. Concept, Processes and Projects in Eboh,

F.C.Okoje, C and Auchu (eds). Enugu, Nigeria, Auto Century Publishers Company limited pp. 31-41.

deJanvry, A. and E. Sadoulet (2001). Income Strategies among Rural Households in Mexico. *The Role of Off- Farm Activities*. *World Development*. 29(3): 467-480.

Ellis, F. (2000). Rural livelihood diversity in developing countries. Analysis, policy, methods. Oxford University press.

Ekong E. E. (2003): An introduction to rural sociology 2nd Ed. Nigeria, Dove Educational publishers limited, pp58-90.

Freeman A.H and Ellis F. (2005). Implications of livelihood strategies in agricultural research: A Kenya case study”, in Ellis and Freeman (Eds), *Rural Livelihoods and poverty Reduction policies*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp 198-212

Haggblade S; Hazel,P.B and Readon T. (2002). Strategies for Stimulating Poverty Alleviating Growth in the Rural Non-Farm Economy. <http://econpaper.Hbs.se/paperfp/92/htm>. Retrieved 5th May, 2014.

Haggblade, S;Hazel, P.B and Reardon T. (2007). *Transforming the Rural Non-Farm Economy*. John Hopkins University Press Baltimore.

Nwaru,J.c. (2004). Rural Credit Market and Resources use in Arable Crop production in Imo state of Nigeria. Ph.D dissertation, MichealOkpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Nigeria.

Ranish, A. and Stewart, F. (2002). Linkages in Rural Economy Development. A Philippines Case study. Manila Philippines Institute Development.

Ruben, R. and M. Van den Berg. Non-Farm Employment and Poverty Alleviation of Rural Households in Honduras. *World Development*. 2001. 29(3): 549-560.

Tolobonse, E. B. and Adekunle, O.A. (2000).
Adoption of cowpea protection
recommendations by rural farmers in Benue

State Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural
Extension 4:74-48.