



## GENDER DIMENSION IN LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

<sup>1</sup>Alonge, G. O., <sup>1</sup>Makinde, G. E. O., <sup>1</sup>Owolade, E. O., <sup>1</sup>Martins, M. O. and <sup>1</sup>Adegbite, O. O.

<sup>1</sup>Federal College of Animal Health and Production Technology, Moor Plantation Ibadan

Correspondent contact details: charislonge2007@yahoo .com

### ABSTRACT

Gender is a social construct rather than a biological condition Multi stage sampling procedure was used to select a sample size of 190 livestock farmers. The result revealed that 63.2% of the respondents were males and 36.8% were females. The married males were 56.0% and 27.0% were females. At all the levels of education (primary, secondary and tertiary) males were more than females. Males who depended on livestock production as only source of income were 28.4% while the females were 7.3%. However, females who considered other livelihood sources before their livestock production activities were 19% while males were 9%. Males who were engaged in sheep, goat and cattle production were 3.7%, 23.0% and 37.0% respectively and females were 5.0%, 30.0% and 2.1% respectively. Males who self-sponsored their livestock production were 47.0% and females were 3.0.0%. Males who used intensive system of management and sourced their labour were 12.0% and 30.0% respectively while the females were 3.7% and 5.3% respectively. Livestock production as a source of income was identified by 62.1% males and 36.0% females. All the livestock activities were carried out by both genders. However, Males participated more in herding (83.2%), milking (38.3%), hoof trimming (88.1%), ear notching (92.1%), tagging (78.5%), branding (81.1%), castrating (60.0%), silage and hay making (30.0%), dehorning (86.3%), dipping (82.1%), breeding (43.3%), and medication (81.0%) while females were more engaged in feeding (29.4%) and cleaning (60.0%). Chi-square test revealed that the sex of farmers influenced livestock routine management practices. Both males and females are engaged in livestock production; however some activities are gender specific. Livestock producers will increase production if given opportunities for credit facilities.

**Keywords:** Gender, Dimensions, Livestock, Livestock producers

### INTRODUCTION

Livestock are domesticated animals raised in agricultural setting to produce commodities such as food, fibre, labour and also for profit. Raising animals (animal husbandry) is a component of modern agriculture and has been practiced in many countries since the transition to farming from hunter-gathering lifestyles. The following outlines the functions of livestock: food supply, source of tractor power, manure production, medium of exchange, source of raw materials, means of investment, source of cash, source of security, source of social and cultural identity and it can be forms of gifts and a source of capital (FAO, 2009).

Livestock are the central means of survival for pastoral nomadic. Access to livestock and their products are indispensable for their household economics, social and cultural survival. Access to livestock by different household members in nomadic pastoral system is a complex issue. The different household members have degrees of claims to the same animals (Joeke and Pointing, 1991). The dual role of livestock as a source of subsistence and basis for wealth and prestige reflects entitlement of different household members to livestock and its products, based on their responsibilities and acquisition through several means. Men are generally associated with large animals as herd managers and are generally considered owners of cattle, with women and children having users privileges. Women, however do own livestock. Small ruminants kept by nomadic households are more the property of women than men which they acquire via gifts from their fathers and husbands at marriage through dowries and bride prices and via purchase with

proceeds from brewing, sales of milk and dairy products and wage labour (Water- Bayer, 1998).

Gender is therefore a socioeconomic variable used to analyse roles, responsibilities, constraints, opportunities and incentives of people involved in agriculture (Poats, 1991). Reddy (2005) refers to gender as a social construction rather than a biological condition. Gender refers to the social meaning of biological sex differences. Gender roles are roles that are played by both women and men which are not determined by biological factors but by the Socioeconomics and cultural environment or situation (ICA-ILO, 2001: Mollel and Mtenga, 2000). Gender affects the distribution of resources, wealth, work, decision-making, political power as well as the entitlements within the family and in public use (Welch *et al*, 2000 and FAO, 2006). Livestock production pattern differs widely among ecological zones and social politically systems in Nigeria. Traditionally men dominate livestock production and ownership of more valuable stock and the decision making in the production system. Women on the other hand are almost always responsible for poultry and small ruminants such as goats. In fact their livestock is often one of the few sources of income over which women have complete control. Although, all household members are usually involved in livestock production but gender discrimination usually deny women access to resources, rights and services.

There is usually gender difference in work roles within different systems of livestock production. This study therefore considered gender dimension in livestock production in Oyo state. It attempted to describe the socioeconomic factors responsible for gender dimension in livestock



production in the study area. It examined gender roles in livestock production activities and the opportunities derived in livestock production along gender lines in Oyo state.

#### METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Oyo state located in south west geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select the sample size of one hundred and ninety livestock farmers used for the study were only ruminant famers. The first stage involved identification and purposive selection of the ten clusters where ruminant livestock producers are known to inhabit and it includes (Ipapo, Ago-amodu, Oyo West, Oyo East, Ibarapa East, Iseyin |local government area, Atiba local government, Saki west, Surulere and Ogbomoso). The second stage involved the selection of the villages where the ruminant producers settled while the third stage involved a random selection of 19 respondents from each of the identified villages making a total of 190 respondents. Before the preparation of the questionnaire in-depth interview with key informants were conducted and information obtained was introduced in to the structured questionnaire used to collect information from the

selected respondents. Data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistics such as: frequency distribution and percentage. Chi-square was used to analyse the relationship between respondents' gender and roles in livestock production.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result revealed that 63.2% of the respondents were males and 36.8% were females. The married males were 56.0% and 27.0% were females. At all the levels of education (primary, secondary and tertiary) males were more than females. Majority of the respondents were Muslim (57.4%) and 36% were Christians. Males who depended on livestock production as only source of income were 28.4% while the females were 7.3%. However, females who considered other livelihood sources before their livestock production activities were 18.0% while males were 9.0%. This shows that in the study area both men and women are engaged in livestock production however, men seem to dominate the business. This agrees with the general statement that in livestock production men seem to eclipse women in terms of ownership of more valuable stock, the decision making and the control of livestock production (FAO, 2006).

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents by their socioeconomic characteristic**

Variables	Male	Female	Total
<b>Sex</b>	63.2	36.8	100
<b>Marital status</b>			
Single	1.5	1.1	2.6
Married	55.7	26.8	80.5
Divorced	0.5	1.5	1.6
Separated	1.5	0.5	2.1
Widowed	3.7	6.8	13.2
<b>Religion</b>			
Islam	40	17.4	57.4
Christianity	19.5	17.4	36.8
Traditional	3.2	2.6	5.8
<b>Level education</b>			
Tertiary education	7.4	2.1	9.5
Secondary Education	5.8	7.9	13.7
Primary Education	23.7	15.8	39.5
Adult Education	26.3	11.1	37.5
<b>Level of livelihood combination</b>			
Livestock Production only	28.45	3.7	32.1
Others 1 <sup>st</sup> Livestock 2 <sup>nd</sup>	8.9	18.9	27.9
Livestock 1 <sup>st</sup> Crop 2 <sup>nd</sup>	14.2	7.4	21.5
Crop 1 <sup>st</sup> livestock 2 <sup>nd</sup>	6.8	4.2	11.1
Livestock 1 <sup>st</sup> Other 2 <sup>nd</sup>	4.7	2.6	7.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>100</b>

Males who were engaged in sheep, goat and cattle production were 3.7%, 23.0% and 37.0% respectively and females were 5%, 30% and 2.1% respectively. Both sexes involved in the production of sheep, goat and cattle were 8.4%, 52.6% and 39.0% respectively. Males who self-sponsored their

livestock production were 47% and females were 30%. Males who used intensive system of management and sourced their labour were 12% and 30% respectively while the females were 3.7% and 5.3% respectively. This study shows that men and women of all ages participated in livestock



production in the study area however; men owned and managed more of the cattle than females who owned and managed more of the sheep and goats.

Women involvement in small ruminant production is a source of income to them.

**Table 2: Respondents livestock management systems and practices**

Variables	Male	Female	Total
<b>Type of livestock</b>			
Sheep	3.7	4.7	8.4
Goat	22.6	30	52.6
Cattle	36.8	2.1	39
<b>Source of finding</b>			
Self	47.4	29.5	76.8
Family	10	5.8	15.8
Cooperative Society	4.2	1.1	5.3
Bank Loan	1.5	0.5	2.1
<b>Types of housing system</b>			
Intensive	11.6	3.7	15.8
Semi intensive	27.45	21.1	48.4
Extensive	24.2	12.1	35.8
<b>Use of labour</b>			
Hired labour	29.5	5.3	37.9
Family Labour	33.7	31.6	62.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>

Respondents who produced livestock as a source of income were 98% out of which 62.1% were males and 35.7% were females. The males who agreed that livestock production improved their standard of living were 52.1% and 26.3% were females Table 3. Also, the result of Table 3 shows that 82.1% of the respondents used their livestock as collateral for soft loans from their friends, that is they act as a buffer for the farmers during emergency financial constraints. More males (57.9%) depended on their livestock as a collateral for loan than females (24.22%). Men are

generally bread winners in most societies of the world and usually are expected to bear more family financial burden than females. They are likely to take more financial risks like using their livestock as collateral for loan. Only 30.5% of the respondents prefer livestock production as a business compared to other livelihood sources. More females 20% prefer the business than males 10.50%. This may be because; livestock owned by women is one of the few sources of income in which they have complete control.

**Table 3: Opportunities derived in livestock production along gender lines**

Variables	Male	Female	Total
<b>Source of Income</b>			
Yes	62.1	35.7	97.8
No	1.1	1.1	2.2
<b>Improved Standard of Living</b>			
Yes	52.1	26.3	78.4
No	11.1	10.5	21.6
<b>Collateral for Loans</b>			
Yes	57.9	24.2	82.1
No	5.3	12.6	17.9
<b>Preferred Source of livelihood</b>			
Yes	10.5	20	30.5
No	52.6	16.8	69.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4 below presents the result of the livestock production activities along gender lines. All the livestock activities were carried out by both genders. However, Males participated more in herding (83.2%), marketing (25.3%), de-worming (58.4%) milking(38.3%, hoof trimming (88.1%), ear notching (92.1%, tagging (78.5%), branding

(81.1%), castrating (60.0)%, silage and hay making (30.0%), dehorning (86.3%), dipping (82.1%), breeding (43.3%), grooming (38.4%), delousing(50.0% and medication (81.0)% while females were more engaged in feeding (29.4%) and cleaning (60.0%).The result shows that livestock production activities, resources and opportunities



are influenced by gender, that is, by the socioeconomic and cultural dimension of being male or female in the study area.

**Table 4: Percentage distribution of respondent by livestock production activities**

Variables	Male	Female	Both
Feeding	24.7	29.4	45.8
Cleaning	3.6	59.5	36.9
Herding	83.2	0.5	16.3
Marketing	25.3	14.7	60
Deworming	58.4	2.6	40
Milking	38.4	15.8	45.8
Hoof Trimming	88.4	11.6	
Ear Notching	92.1	7.9	
Tagging	78.9	0.5	21.6
Branding	81.1	2.1	16.8
Castrating	59.5	0.5	40
Silage /Haymaking	30.0	0.5	64.2
Docking	77.4	1.6	21
Dehorning	86.3	1.6	16.3
Dipping	82.1	1.6	16.3
Breeding	43.2	4.7	52.1
Grooming	38.4	6.9	54.7
Delousing	50.0	6.3	43.7
Mediation	81.0	1.6	17.4

The study revealed a significant relationship between the sex of livestock farmers and the following livestock production activities cleaning, herding, marketing, milking, grooming and de-lousing. In the study area livestock production activities are influenced by gender in the study area as in table 5. This is supported by Granding *et al* (1991) who reported that among the Maasai people men are largely the decision makers in livestock production, and is in charge of general

herd management. They are in charge of watering to make sure the animals get enough water and pay hired labour when necessary. Men also, carry out most of the dipping and spraying of animals. They search for any missing animals and perform minor veterinary functions. The Maasai women on the other hand, retain the primary responsibilities for dairy-related activities. Women take care of stocks kept near the camp especially sick ones.

**Table 5: Chi Square Result on Gender Distribution and Roles in Livestock Production**

Variables	df	$\chi^2$	p-value
Feeding			
Sex	5	1.214	0.61
Cleaning			
Sex	5	15.642	0.025
Herding			
Sex	3	4.346	0.042
Marketing			
Sex	5	13.456	0.05
De-worming			
Sex	3	6.129	0.851
Milking			
Sex	3	4.805	0.031
Ear notching			
Sex	3	6.149	0.148
Branding			
Sex	5	3.342	0.2
Dipping			
Sex	3	3.342	0.181
Breeding			
Sex	3	2.153	0.123
Grooming			
Sex	3	2.789	0.039



Variables	df	$\chi^2$	p-value
Delousing			
Sex	3	7.786	0.038
Meditation			
Sex	3	7.245	0.582
Tattooing			
Sex	3	3.567	0.299

**P-value  $\geq$  0.05**

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATION**

The study established that males and females are engaged in livestock production; however some activities are gender specific. Both female and male livestock producers should be given recognition and afforded opportunities for credit facilities. Equal recognition and access to livestock production information should be made available to both genders by stakeholders in the livestock industry.

**REFERENCES**

Granding, B. E., de Leeuw, P. N. and de Souza, M. (1991). Labour and Livestock Management. In: Solomon, B., de Leeuw, P. N., Granding, B. E. and Neate, P. J. H. (ed) Maasai Herding: an Analysis of the Livestock Production Systems of Maasai Pastoralist in Eastern Kajiodo Districts, Kenya. *ILCA System Study 4*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopa. Pp 71-82.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nation (2006); Women in Food Production, Food Handling and Nutrition with Special Emphasis on Africa. *Food and Nutrition Paper 8* FAO, Rome, Italy, Pp. 233.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nation (2009). The State of Food and Agriculture Livestock in the balance [http://www.fao.org/ag/aginfo/resources/en/publications/agapubs/hpai\\_and\\_beyond.pdf](http://www.fao.org/ag/aginfo/resources/en/publications/agapubs/hpai_and_beyond.pdf)

ICA-ILO (2001). Gender Issues in Cooperatives. An ICA-ILO Perspective. From <http://www.ica.coop/gender/ica-ilo->

manual/background.htm1#rples (Retrieved march 29, 2007)

Joekes, S. and Pointing, J. (1991): *Women in Pastoral Societies in East and West Africa*. Dry lands. Network Programme Issue Paper 28. IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development), London, UK. 30pp

Mollel, N. M. and Mtenga, N. A. (2000): Gender Roles in the Household and Farming Systems of Techenzema Morogoro-Tanzania. *South Africa Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 29: 73-88

Poats, S. V, (1999) The Role of Gender in Agricultural Development. *Issues in Agriculture 3*. CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) Washington DC. USA, Pp3

Reddy, G. (2005): With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identify in South India (Worlds of Desire) *The Chicago Series on Sexuality, Gender, and Culture*, University of Chicago press .s

Welch, C. I., Alemu, B., Msaki, T., Sengendo, M, Kigutha, H. and Wolff, A. (2000), *Improving Household Food Security: Institutions Gender and Integrated Approaches, USA*, Basis Management Entity.

Water Bayer, (1988). Dairying by Settled Fulani Agro-pastoralist in Central Nigeria: the Role of Women and Implications for Dairy Development. *Farming Systems and Resource Economics in the Tropics 4*. Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk, Kiel, Germany, p 328