



LIVELIHOOD DYNAMICS AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS DIFFERENTIALS OF SEMI-URBAN AND URBAN FARMING HOUSEHOLDS IN AKWA IBOM STATE

Uwem, C. A., Etuk, U. R. and Asa, U. A.

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State

Correspondence author details: unyrobot@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study assessed livelihood dynamics and socioeconomic status differentials of semi-urban and urban farming households in Uyo, Local Government Area (LGA), Akwa Ibom State. One hundred and thirty-one respondents were selected through a gender-based stratified proportional sampling procedure from Anua Offot (urban=81) and Ikot Oku Idio (semi-urban=50) communities of Uyo, LGA. Focus Group Discussion, house listing, interview using questionnaire and infrastructure checklist were used to collect data. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used in data analysis. Thirteen major livelihood activities classified as agricultural, trading/marketing, micro processing and service-oriented were identified. There was a significant difference in the number of livelihood activities between urban and semi-urban households ($p=0.0069<0.05$) especially in service-oriented activities ($p=0.0012<0.05$). Significant differences existed in socioeconomic status between urban and semi-urban farming households ($p=0.2547>0.05$). Agriculture based livelihoods were dominant in urban (20.9%) and semi-urban (30%) locations while service-oriented livelihoods earned the highest mean incomes in both urban (₦54,000) and semi-urban (₦56,000) locations. Pair-wise ranking revealed most preferred livelihoods in both locations were as follows: men and youths (poultry production, transport business and trading on cement); youths (traditional bag manufacture and Information Communication Technologies Services) and women (agro-processing, petty trading, soap making and hair dressing). The study concluded that significant differences existed in livelihood activities and socioeconomic status between urban and semi-urban farming households in Uyo LGA, Akwa Ibom State. It was recommended that opportunities in service-oriented livelihoods be provided for farming households in both locations. Even development of the area should target location-specific livelihoods of farming households to improve their socioeconomic status and further reduce differentials.

INTRODUCTION

Democracy as an acceptable means of social control and order has great potentials to stimulate development as direct dividends of participatory government. Oruonye (2013) posits that grassroot democracy can be seen as a tendency towards designing political processes where as much decision-making authority as possible is shifted to the lowest level of organization. This is one of the strongest points in favour of democracy especially as it guarantees the active involvement of the so-called grassroots. Rural development on the other hand deals with the process of improving the living conditions of rural communities in such a way to bridge the gap between the rural communities and their urban counterparts so as to make the rural economies self-sustaining and retentive of its population which has been drifting steadily to the urban centres (Oruonye, 2013). Studies therefore need to regularly evaluate if government is fulfilling this important function of ensuring that the grassroots reap development as a direct dividend that democracy should offer. Evaluating urbanization, livelihoods and the areas transiting from rural through semi-urban areas becomes imperative for meaningful scientific efforts.

As a country experiences urbanization, significant changes in livelihoods and socioeconomic status also occurs in the urban, semi-urban and rural areas. Satterthwaite *et al* (2010) describes urbanization as the increasing share of a nation's population living in urban areas

(and thus declining share of living in rural areas. In line with this, Afriyie, *et al.* (2013) observed that urban expansion exposes peri-urban communities to a number of challenges including land use changes, tenure insecurity, high cost of living and transformation in peri-urban livelihoods. On the other hand, Carney (1998) describes a livelihood as capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities necessary for a means of living. There is a consensus by researchers that livelihood options across urban, semi-urban and rural areas are diverse depending on factors influencing them.

One major effect of urbanization is the gradual displacement of agricultural activities coupled with high cost of living as a result of the emergence of monetary economy (Afriyie *et al*, 2013). It is also argued that the process of urban growth and their implications for farming and farm sizes are likely to be shaped by global influences as well as localized aspects (Djurfeldt, 2013). Similarly, urban areas and cities present a variety of opportunities for residents to generate wealth but at the same time also a myriad of challenges to the urban poor as they tend to depend on the cash economy for their livelihoods (Ayerakwa, 2017). As a result of the interactions between rural and urban areas, the peri-urban dwellers are exposed to a wide range of livelihood options and choices including farm and non-farm-based activities (Abass *et al*, 2013). Satterthwaite *et al*, (2010) posited that individual household members engaged in different activities while sharing

resources and assets. From the forgoing, it is obvious that livelihood dynamics will likely correlate with socioeconomic status differentials when contrasted between the semi-urban and urban farming households. Dossa *et al* (2011) reported significant differentials in low and medium socioeconomic groups in livestock rearing. On the basis of asset ownership and access to utility, the study showed that the poorest and low income and high-income households were motivated to urban farming by income generation and nutritional status improvement and savings, and income source diversification respectively (Dossa, et al, 2011). Examining households access, and dependence upon a diversity of occupational sectors is a central theme in many development studies and is often discussed in the context of poverty, urbanization, household risks, conservation and coping strategies (Cinner and Bodin, 2010). Although in recent times considerable attention in research have focused on urban and peri-urban agriculture (Ayerakwa, 2017), extant literature hardly explore livelihood dynamics in the context of socioeconomic status between the location divide (Ayerakwa, 2017; Mougeot, 2011 and Uwem, 2016). This study therefore is designed to fill this gap by providing information on the livelihood dynamics in the context of socioeconomic status between the urban and semi-urban of Uyo Local Government Area as a case study. In order to highlight the impacts of urbanization on natural resources usage; this will help in designing effective development and conservation strategy for even development for the rural economy which has a multiplier effect on the urban economy. Accordingly, the specific objectives of the study include, to:

1. describe the socioeconomic characteristics of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA
2. analyze the socioeconomic status of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA.
3. identify and categorize livelihood activities of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo local government area
4. establish livelihood activities differentials between Urban and Semi-Urban Areas of Uyo
5. analyse livelihood diversification between semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA and
6. estimate income earned from key livelihood activities of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo local government area

METHODOLOGY

The study locations of Anua Offot (urban) and Ikot Oku Idio (semi-urban) both lie between 5.03778N and 7.94737E along Nwaniba road

which stretches out to the limit of Uyo capital City Development Area (NEWMAP, 2017). Land inheritance as a tenure system is still practiced which explains fragmentation of holdings. The farm lands are undulating with a tropical climate of high temperature of humid (wet) rainfall zone is dominated by annual rainfall of 2500-3000mm. The Anua community is the host to a missionary hospital, St. Lukes hospital which has been in existence for more than 50 years with a School of Nursing and Midwifery within the same premises.

Ikot Oku Idio is an adjoining community to Anua with more agricultural based activities being carried on by the inhabitants. This semi-urban area shares a common gully erosion site which stretches through the communities with crop production activities taking place around the gully erosion site. The Anua Offot study location is gradually expanding into Ikot Oku Idio with a mixture of natives and non-natives found residing in both areas. This makes it a suitable site for a study that is premised on the urban and semi-urban characteristics. In Anua Offot, less land is available for agriculture while Ikot Oku Idio is gradually experiencing increase in non-farm livelihoods just like Anua Offot. The traditional institutions of family kingship is still enduring in the communities where five royal families of Nung Ekong, Ikot Umo Udo, Nung Mbom, Ikot Eda and Nung Obio Akama take active part in community development projects.

The survey design was used for the study. One in-depth interview, Focus Group Discussion was conducted in each of the study location. House listing of all buildings at farm sites around gully erosion sites (Anua Offot and Ikot Oku Idio) was carried out. This provided the sampling frame for the study. Ten percent (10%) of household heads on the basis of gender were selected through a stratified proportional sampling procedure. Respondents were picked from each stratum via a simple random sampling procedure. In Anua offot, 25 females, 39 males and 17 youths were selected while in Ikot Oku Idio 23 males, 15 females and 12 youths were picked. In all, a total of 81 and 50 respondents in Anua Offot and Ikot Oku Idio were selected respectively. This gave a sample size of 131 respondents. The questionnaire was the instrument used to conduct personal interview with the respondents. Infrastructure check list was designed and used to determine households' access and availability of infrastructure to them. Descriptive statistics (mean, frequencies and ranking) were used to analyze socioeconomic characteristics and status of farming households while inferential statistics one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and paired t-test were used to analyze differentials in livelihoods and socioeconomic status of respondents.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic characteristics

The respondents in the study were predominantly people in the active age. Respondents mean age from the urban area (Anua Offot) was almost the same (mean=41.94) with that of the semi-urban dwellers (Ikot Oku Idio; mean=41.52). The implication here is that a greater population of the active labour force were engaged in agriculture in both areas. This also means that there is a tendency for multiplicity of livelihood activities in the area since they have the physical strength and energy to be engaged in diverse activities at the same time.

The result agrees in part with findings by Uwem, (2016) and Gautam and Andersen, (2016) where the active urban population were found to be engaged in farming activities in addition to other income generating activities. Similarly, there was a high proportion of married households in Anua Offot (65.4%) when compared to Ikot Oku Idio (60%). This is in line with Ekong (2003) who reported that marriage was a cherished culture of the people of the area.

Larger household sizes were more in proportion in Ikot Oku Idio (mean=7.12) than in Anua Offot (mean=6.81). As means of survival, households' diversification of livelihood activities

is likely. This is a means of responding to more responsibility in providing for the semi-urban households with high probability of increasing and further exerts pressure on resources for sustenance. As a strategy, relatively large households tend to engage in livelihoods that are labour-intensive using family labour which is cheaper and readily available depending on the composition.

In the two study locations, the mean number of years spent to acquire formal education in the urban (mean=10.14) semi-urban (mean=10.04) and was nearly the same. In spite of the similarity, there was a higher proportion of graduates of tertiary institutions engaged in urban farming in the semi-urban (24%) than in the main urban area (16%). This result is consistent with similar findings by Uwem (2016) who identified a high proportion of graduates as urban farmers which was also confirmed by Dossa *et al* (2011) who reported that urban households members (including unemployed graduates) were motivated into farming by the need to address the food security of their households. It also confirms the assertion that diversification of livelihoods of semi-urban and urban farming households was a strategy for coping with economic and environmental shocks and instrumental to poverty reduction (Gautam and Andersen, 2016).

Table 2: Socioeconomic Characteristics of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo

Item	Socioeconomic Characteristics	Study Location of farm households					
		Anua Offot (urban)			Ikot Uko Idio (semi-urban)		
		F (N=81)	%	Mean	F (N=50)	%	Mean
1	Age (Years)						
	<21	2	2.5		1	2.00	
	21-30	13	16		9	18.00	
	31-40	22	27.2		17	34.00	
	41-50	26	32.1		10	20.00	
	51-60	11	13.7		8	16.00	
	>60	7	8.5	41.94	5	10.00	41.52
2	Marital Status						
	Single	20	24.7		14	28.00	
	Married	53	65.4		31	60.00	
	Widowed	8	9.90		6	12.00	
3	Household size						
	1-3	14	17.30	6.81	8	15.30	7.12
	4-6	23	28.40		16	30.50	
	7-9	29	35.80		19	37.40	
	10-12	11	13.60		6	11.50	
	>12	4	4.90		3	5.30	
4	Educational Attainment						
	No formal Education	2	2.5	10.14	2	4.00	10.04
	Primary	24	24		16	32.00	
	Drop out	4	4		2	4.00	
	Secondary	35	35		18	36.00	
	Tertiary	16	16		12	24.00	

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Table 2b: Socioeconomic Characteristics of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo continued

Item	Socioeconomic Characteristics	Study location of farm households					
		Anua Offot (urban)			Ikot Udo Idio (semi-urban)		
		F (N=81)	%	Mean	F (N=50)	%	Mean
1	Religion	f	%		F	%	
	Christian	90	73		44	86	
	Traditionalist	6.2	5		6	12	
	Atheist	3.7	3		0	0	
	Islam	0	0		1	2	
2	Ethnic Composition						
	Ibibio	42	48.1		29	57	
	Annang	22	20.9		13	26	
	Oron	7	4.90		3	6	
	Others	10	26.10		6	11	
3	Monthly Income (N:K)						
	<10,000	10	12.3	37,122	7	14	33,744
	10,001-30,000	24	24		19	38	
	30,001-50,000	27	27		14	28	
	50,001-70,000	16	16		9	18	
	>70,000	4	4		1	2	

Source: Field Survey, 2017

The result (Table 2b) also revealed that the dominant religion in the area was the Christianity with a lower proportion of households recorded in the urban (73%) than in the semi-urban areas (86%) while traditionalist (12%) were the next dominant belief system; and Islam being the third dominant religion in Ikot Oku Idio (2%). The Ibibios made up the highest percentage of the three ethnic groups in both Anua Offot (48.1%) and Ikot Oku Idio (57%). The result is in tandem with Ekong (2003) who reported that marriage was a cherished culture of the people of the area as well as holding multiple belief system but with Christianity being the dominant of all. The mean income from the urban (N37,122) was higher than the mean amount earned (N33,744) by the semi-urban households. This shows that livelihood activities in the urban areas of Uyo LGA generated higher income earnings to households than those in semi-urban areas. There was a tendency for livelihood activities in the urban areas to lead to improved socioeconomic status than those of the semi-urban areas. Livelihood dynamics in the semi-urban had a tendency to move towards those activities in the urban that brought the highest income to households. This supports Ekong,(2003) who reported that the need to have better livelihoods by people had resulted in migration to the urban areas of Nigeria. Similarly, the dominant monthly income of range of N30,001-N50,000 was recorded in Anua Offot (27%) while a lower range of N10,001-N30,000 was dominant among farmers in Ikot Oku Idio (38%). This result is slightly lower than that by Uwem (2016) where the monthly income of 29% of urban livestock farmers in Uyo was N32,000-37,000. Similar findings by

Ayerakwa (2011) and Mougeot (2011) reported that urban agriculture as an important economic survival option for cities dwellers of diverse socioeconomic status. This is reflected in the household income for which this study adopted the minimum wage as a benchmark for classification. By implication, livelihood dynamics is influenced by the process of urbanization. The asset base of a given household in terms of skills and tangible productive asset accumulation accounts for the diversities of livelihoods that it is engaged in. This also agrees with the assertion that the transition from semi-urban to urban is accompanied by livelihood dynamics and consequently socioeconomic differentials within and between both urban and semi-urban locations which is supported by previous studies (Gautum and Andersen, 2016; Wuder *et al*, 2014).

Socioeconomic status of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

The study explored the socioeconomic status households engaged in farming and other livelihood activities using a number of indicators. Socioeconomic status classified households into poor, average and rich on the basis of the equivalent monthly salaries workers from the junior staff, senior and very senior officers to correspond to poor, average and rich status. Other indicators used to compare socioeconomic status were households' expenditures on various items, sources of energy for household lighting, cooking and domestic water usage. Waste disposal methods, mode of land acquisition, types of houses occupied as well as the material for which the construction of the roofs were considered as indicators of



socioeconomic status. From the results of this study, households in the poor status class were more in the Anua Offot(urban) (13%) than in the Ikot Oku Idio(semi-urban)(10%);contrastingly, a higher proportion of households were recorded in the average class in the urban(Anua Offot) (49%) than in the semi-urban(Ikot Oku Idio)(29%) while the rich households were still more in the urban(19%) than in the semi-urban area of study(12%).These results confirm the prevalence of urban poverty (Gautam and Andersen, 2016) and further agrees with Dossa *et al* (2011) who classified households into low, medium and high socioeconomic status as being engaged in urban farming as well as other livelihood activities.

The result also showed that the semi-urban farming households spent greater proportion of their income (55%) on food than the urban

households (50%) while expenditures on health, transport, housing, household items were the same; expenditure on clothing and education were higher among urban respondents (mean=10%) than the semi-urban (mean=8%). This agrees with study by Dossa *et al* (2011) who reported high expenditure pattern among urban residents' farmers in three West African cities including Kano, Nigeria.

Similarly, more urban farming households (58%) patronized hospital for their health care needs than the semi-urban households (42%).This confirms the position by Uwem (2016) who posits that urban households have access to modern infrastructure before the semi-urban or rural ones. This result also confirms the findings which indicate continued poor living conditions of non-urban dwellers when compared urban to their counterparts (Sanda, 1988).

Table 3: Socioeconomic Status of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

Item	Socioeconomic Characteristics	Study Location of farm households			
		Anua Offot (urban)		Ikot Udo Idio (semi-urban)	
		F (N=81)	%	F (N=50)	%
1	Social Status	F	%	f	%
	Poor	13	16	10	20
	Average	49	60.5	29	29
	Rich	19	23.50	12	12
2	Itemised Household Expenditure				
	Food	4	50	28	55
	Clothing	8	10	4	7
	Education	8	10	4	8
	Household Items	4	5	3	5
	Transportation	4	5	3	5
	Health	8	10	5	10
	Housing	8	10	5	10
3	Health Services				
	Hospital	47	58	21	42
	Chemist	61	75.3	40	78
	Traditional Birth Attendant	14	17.3	9	18
	Herbalist	18	22.2	13	26
	Church	38	46.9	24	48

Source: Field Survey, 2017

The study revealed that more households (53.1%) in the urban used kerosene and public power supply (PHCN) as energy source in domestic lighting compared to their semi-urban counterparts (44%). On the contrary, a higher proportion of households in the semi-urban (52%) used PHCN and rechargeable lamps (RL) than

those residing in the urban area (38.3%). There were slight differences in the use of PHCN and private generators (PG) between urban (85.2%) and the semi-urban respondents (86%) as well as in the mix of use of PHCN and kerosene with more in Ikot Oku Idio (62%) than in Anua Offot (55.6%).

Table 3: Socioeconomic Status of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

Item	Socioeconomic Characteristics	Study Location of farm households					
		Anua Offot (urban)			Ikot Udo Idio(semi-urban)		
		F (N=81)	%	Mean	F (N=50)	%	Mean
1	Sources of Energy for Household Lighting						
	Kerosene +Public Power supply (PHCN)	43	53.1		22	44	
	Kerosene +Rechargeable Lamps	20	24.7		19	38	
	Public Power supply(PHCN) + Rechargeable Lamps	31	38.3		27	52	
	Kerosene + Private Generator	51	62.9		30	58	
	Public Power supply (PHCN) + Private Generator	69	85.2		44	86	
	Public Power supply (PHCN) + Kerosene	45	55.6		32	62	
2	Major Sources Energy for Household Cooking						
	Kerosene +Fuel wood	33	40.7		20	40	
	Fuel wood +cooking gas	34	41.9		23	46	
	Kerosene + Cooking gas	56	69.1		33	64	
3	Sources of Water Supply Household						
	Boreholes	71	87.70		43	83.9	
	Rain water	30	37.00		26	50.0	
	Piped water	10	12.50		7	14.0	
	Stream	0	0		3	6.0	
	Water vendor	8	9.9		4	8.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2017

This suggest that households of the low or medium socioeconomic status (SES) tend to depend more on cheaper energy sources for household lighting than those in the medium and high SES who could afford sources (mix) that may be costlier. This is consistent with the findings by Dossa *et al* (2011) who reported that urban farm households in the low SES had no access to electricity where as 75% of those in the high SES had.

Expectedly, more farm households in the urban location (69.1%) used kerosene and cooking as sources energy for household cooking than their semi-urban counterparts (64%). Similarly, energy mix including fuel wood were more utilized by semi-urban households (40-46%) than the urban respondents (40.7-41.9%). Arild *et al* (2014) earlier reported that the poor relied more heavily on subsistent products such as wood fuels and wild fruits harvested from natural areas. On sources of water for households, boreholes were the primary source of household water supply in both the urban (87.7%) and the semi-urban areas (83%) which is an indication of low access to public water supply. This contrast sharply with findings by Dossa *et al* (2011) who reported more than 75% of respondents who had piped water present in their homes in a study of urban farming which incorporates both locations also used in this study.

Result also showed that the commonest method of waste disposal was dumping in the bush by the semi-urban households (56%) whereas the highest proportion of urban households used the refuse bins more (77.8%) (Table.3b). Use of refuse bins attract bills which goes to confirm that since there are no bushes to dump waste, the urban households are compelled to use them. Afriyie *et al* (2013) opined that urbanization exposes peri-urban areas to changes in land use, pollution and high cost of living. On mode of land ownership, the semi-urban households acquired land mostly through inheritance with a high number of respondents in the semi-urban (54%) than in the urban (46.9%). Djurfeldt and Jirstrom (2013) reported that urban growth had their implications for farming and challenges in farm sizes and they were likely to be shaped by both global influences as well as more localized aspects.

Result of the study also showed that more urban households lived in blocks of flat(53%) than semi-urban households (42%); corrugated iron sheets were the primary materials used in construction of roof tops of buildings most of the buildings in the semi-urban Uyo (66%) than the urban areas of the capital city (61.7%). This an evidence of gradual expansion of the urban into the semi-urban areas changing the socioeconomic dynamics of the population (Arild *et al* (2014); Dossa *et al*, 2011; Afriyie *et al*, 2013)



Item	Socioeconomic Characteristics	Study Location of farm households					
		Anua Offot (urban) F(N=8)			Ikot Udo Idio(semi-urban) F (N=50)		
		F	%	Mean	F	%	Mean
1	Waste Disposal Method						
	Bush	23	28.4		29		56
	Backyard	18	22.2		21		42
	Gully site	8	9.9		7		14
	Burning	19	23.5		21		42
	Refuse Bin	63	77.8		23		46
2	Mode of Land Acquisition						
	Inheritance	38	46.9		28		54
	Direction Purchase	8	9.6		10		20
	Gift	7	8.6		5		10
3	Types of Houses occupied						
	Blocks of Flats	43	53		21		42
	Bungalow	16	19.8		17		34
	Tenement houses	14	17.3		8		16
	Storey building	8	9.9		4		8
4	Construction Materials(Roofing)						
	Corrugation Iron sheets	50	61.7		34		66
	Aluminum roof	15	18.5		6		12
	Asbestos	10	12.3		5		10
	Concrete decking	4	4.9		2		4
	Thatch roofs	2	2.6		4		8

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Livelihood activities semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

The study revealed that there were thirteen major occupation classes engaged in by the households in the two study locations (Table 4.1). In both study locations, farming engaged the highest proportion of households in the study (24.4%). This was followed by public/civil service (12.2%) and driving and medical services (10.7%). The smallest proportions of respondents were

involved in hospitality services (3.1%). The proportion of households involved in farming with more in the semi-urban (Ikot Oku Idio (30%) than in urban (Anua Offot) (20.9%) while nearly the same proportion of households were Public/civil servants in the semi-urban (12.2%) and urban locations (12.0%). This confirms findings by Afriyie *et al* (2013) that effects urban expansion comes with a number of challenges leading to transformation peri-urban livelihoods.

Table 4.1: Livelihood Activities semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

Location	Anua Offot (urban)	Ikot Oku Idio (semi-urban)	Both locations
Livelihood activities	F (%)	F (%)	Total
Farming (Crop, Fisheries and Livestock)	17 (20.9)	15 (30.0)	32 (24.4)
Medical Services	12 (14.8)	2 (4.0)	14 (10.7)
Welding	3 (3.7)	2 (4.0)	5 (3.8)
Driving	6 (7.4)	8 (16.0)	14 (10.7)
Masonry	3 (3.7)	4 (8.0)	7 (5.3)
Public/Civil Service	10 (12.3)	6 (12.0)	16 (12.2)
Hair Dressing	4 (4.9)	3 (6.0)	7 (5.3)
Food Vendor	5 (6.2)	1 (2.0)	6 (4.6)
Drinking Spot	6 (7.4)	1 (2.0)	7 (5.3)
Hospitality Service	3 (3.7)	1 (2.0)	4 (3.1)
Trading/Marketing	5 (6.2)	3 (6.0)	8 (6.1)
Seamstress/Tailoring	4 (4.9)	2 (4.0)	6 (4.6)
Carpentry	3 (3.7)	2 (4.0)	5 (3.8)
Total	81 (100)	50 (100)	131(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Results showed that the mean value for the urban households for paired t-test showed a higher mean value for the urban (Anua Offot = 6.32) compared to the semi-urban (Ikot Oku Idio=3.84) which indicated more livelihood activities among urban households compared to semi-urban ones. This was also followed by a corresponding higher deviation in the number of livelihood activities (SD=4.26) when compared to the semi-urban areas (SD=3.93) (using data from Table 4.1)

Livelihood activities differentials between urban and semi-urban areas of Uyo

The p-value ($p < 0.02 < 0.005$) confirms that the differences in livelihood differentials between the urban and semi-urban households was not due to chance i.e. there existed a significant difference. Furthermore the study showed that there was a greater variation in the number of livelihood activities between urban and semi-urban households (SS between = 540.731) than among households in urban or semi-urban households (SS within= 8.500) (Table 4.2). This implies that the differences was significantly different and goes to support more opportunities in urban than semi-urban as earlier indicated in the ANOVA result analysis in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: ANOVA result on livelihood activities differentials between urban and semi-urban areas of Uyo

Location	Source of Variation	Sum of squares	Df	MS	F	p-value
Urban (Anua Offot) and Semi-urban (Ikot Oku Idio)	Between groups	540.731	8	67.591	31.808	0.002
	Within groups	8.500	4	2.125		
	Total	549.231	12			

Source: Data analysis result, 2017

Livelihood Diversification of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

Livelihood diversification is one of the major findings of this work. More urban farming households (50.2%) were engaged in at least two livelihood activities compared to the semi-urban households (46.8%) (Table 4.3). This was the different when the livelihoods were up to three

different types with more in Ikot Oku Idio (semi-urban) (36.5%) than Anua Offot (urban) (34%). This result is line with Abaas, Afriyie and Adomako (2013) who submitted that peri-urban dwellers are exposed to a wide range of livelihood options and choices including farm and non-farm based activities.

Table 4.3: Livelihood Diversification of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

Number of Livelihood Activities	Anua Offot (urban) f(%)	Ikot Oku Idio (semi-urban) f(%)	Total f(%)
1 One	17 (6.9)	20 (11.8)	37 (8.9)
2 Two	124 (50.2)	71 (41.8)	195 (46.8)
3 Three	84 (34.0)	62 (36.5)	146 (35.0)
4 Four	21 (8.5)	14 (8.2)	35 (8.4)
5 Five	1 (0.4)	3 (1.8)	4 (0.9)
Total	247* (100)	170 *(100)	417* (100)
Mean	2.45	2.75	

Source: Field Survey and analysis (2017)

* Multiples responses

The highest number of livelihood activities (five) found to be more in the semi-urban (1.8%) than in the urban (0.4%) which agrees in part with Ayerakwa (2017) citing previous studies which concluded that opportunities may be different depending on the spatial location of the household and the type of resources at their disposal (Table 4.3). The mean number of livelihood activities engaged in by farm households

were higher in the semi-urban (mean = 2.75) than the number in the urban (mean=2.45).

Average income for key livelihood activities of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA

The highest paying livelihood activities are the services providing ones with an overall average amount of sixty thousand naira (N60,000) followed by trading and marketing with the mean



income of twenty-seven thousand, six hundred and thirty-three naira(N27,633) and least being agriculture/livestock with a mean income of

twenty-three thousand six hundred and sixty-seven naira(N23,667) per month (Table 4.4).

Table 4. 4: Average Income for Key Livelihood Activities of semi-urban and urban farm households in Uyo LGA.

Key Livelihood Activity	Anua (urban)	Offot	Ikot Oku Idio	Average	Rank
Agriculture /Livestock	Amount (₦)		Amount (₦)	Amount (₦)	
Crop farming	15,000		12,000	13500	10
Agro-processing	47000		34000	40500	4
Poultry	20000		14000	17000	9
Average	27,333		20,000	23,667	
Trading/Marketing					
Sales of provision	37000		32500	34750	6
Sales of foodstuff	28100		22200	25150	7
Marketing of agro produce	25000		21000	23000	8
Average	30,033		25,233	27,633	
Service providing activities					
Driving	47000		31000	39000	5
Civil/Public Service	60000		71400	66700	2
Masonry	47000		40000	43500	3
Contract and Supplies	141000		117000	129000	1
Fashion Designing/Tailoring	29000		21000	25000	11
Average	54,000		56,000	60,000	

Source: Field Study (2017)

Although contract and supplies was the highest earning livelihood urban households earned an mean income of N24, 000 more than their semi-urban counterparts while the higher income civil/public servants were found in semi-urban(N71,400) than their urban counterparts(N60,000).Although the least income was derived from crop farming(N13,500),urban farmers earned more(N15,000) than those residing in the semi-urban areas of Uyo LGA (N12,000)(Table 4.4).The mean income of households engaged in trading and marketing were higher among urban households(N30,000) than those in the semi-urban(N25,233)(Table 4.4). This result agrees with report by Gautam and Andersen (2016) who submitted that a uniform pattern of diversification in terms of number of activities for livelihoods but a highly varying degree of resultant well-being across household. According to these researchers (Gautam and Andersen, 2016) well-being (of which income is critical determinant) was not associated with diversification per se but rather on a household involvement in “high returns

sector” such as trading and salaried job. It is also in line with Arild, *et al* (2014) who opined that quantifying the relative and absolute contribution of environmental income was important for understanding the livelihoods of people as they are key determinants of inequality and has implications for welfare.

Pairwise livelihood options for urban and semi-urban households in Uyo LGA

Pairwise ranking analysis result (Table 4.5) showed that men in both locations preferred poultry production and agro-processing livelihoods (ranked 1st and 2nd) in addition to transportation services by households in the urban compared to mushroom farming and trading on cement by the semi-urban dwellers. Similarly, women in the urban and semi-urban areas of Uyo LGA were primarily involved in agro-processing and poultry production (ranked 1st and 2nd); while the urban women took to ICT related services (ranked 3rd), women in the semi-urban households added trading on provision as the 3rd most engaged income generating activity (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5: Pairwise Livelihood options Urban (Anua Offot) and Semi-urban (Ikot Oku Idio) Areas of Uyo LGA.

Gender	Pairwise Livelihood options Urban (Anua Offot)	Rank	Gender	Pairwise Livelihood options Semi-urban (Ikot Oku Idio)	Rank
MEN	Poultry	1 st	MEN	Poultry	1 st
	Agro-processing	2 nd		Agro-processing	2 nd
	Transport services	3 rd		Mush room production	3 rd
	Trading on cement	4 th		Trading on cement	3 rd
	Fish farming	5 th		Transport services	5 th
	Traditional shoe and bag making	5 th		Micro business	6 th
	Micro business	7 th		Hat making	6 th
	Motor and auto mechanic repairs	8 th		Traditional shoe and bag making	8 th
WOMEN	Agro-processing	1 st	WOMEN	Carpentry services	8 th
	Poultry	2 nd		Agro-processing	1 st
	ICT Services	3 rd		Poultry	2 nd
	Trading on provision	4 th		Trading on provision	3 rd
	Hat making	5 th		Soap and cream making	6 th
	Hair dressing	5 th		ICT Services	3 rd
	Micro business	7 th		Fish farming	7 th
	Swine production	7 th		Hair dressing	5 th
	Cake making	9 th		Hat making	7 th
	Soap and cream making	9 th		Micro business	10 th
	Trading on textile	11 th		Tailoring and fashion designing	7 th
YOUTH	Beautification services	11 th	YOUTH	Poultry	1 st
	Interior decoration	12 th		Agro-processing	1 st
	Agro-processing	1 st		ICT Services	1 st
	Poultry	2 nd		Web based services	4 th
	ICT Services	3 rd		Trading on cement	5 th
	Transport services	3 rd		Mushroom production	6 th
	Fish farming	5 th		Micro business	6 th
	Web based services	5 th		Trading on textile	8 th
	Swine production	7 th		Hat making	8 th
	Trading on cement	8 th		Traditional bag making	10 th
	Micro business	9 th		Cake making	11 th
	Trading on textile	10 th			

Source: Field Study (2017)

The youths in both locations preferred agro-processing, poultry production (ranked 1st - 2nd), ICT services and transportation services which were mostly by the youths in the urban area (ranked 3rd). The implication here is that location plays a significant role in the choice of livelihood activities of household members while the youth's livelihood activities is partly influenced by the livelihoods of men and women in each area.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that majority of households' heads, in their active ages, were engaged in agriculture and multiple livelihood activities in both urban and semi-urban areas of

Uyo. Larger household sizes in semi-urban than urban was correlated with more rich and average households in urban areas than in the semi-urban.

Cheaper energy sources and poor waste disposal methods were used by semi-urban households. Significant differences in socioeconomic status existed between the urban and semi-urban households with a higher proportion found among the urban dwellers. Significant livelihood differentials between urban and semi-urban households existed as well as a greater livelihood diversification among semi-urban households than their urban counterparts. There was however higher income from livelihood activities in the urban areas than the semi-urban.



Preferred livelihood mix showed that men and youths were involved in poultry production, transport business and trading on cement while youths were found to engage in traditional bag manufacture and Information Communication Technologies Services and the women were more comfortable with agro-processing, petty trading, soap making and hair dressing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that grassroot democracy must be consciously used as means to reduce the gaps in the socioeconomic status between the urban and semi-urban households. More livelihood opportunities in service-oriented sectors should be created for the semi-urban farming households to drive real even development. It is also recommended that farming households in urban and semi-urban locations should be assisted with extension services to build their capacities agro-entrepreneurship, agro-processing and Information Communication Technologies. Intervention to achieve even and overall development of the state should target the location-specific livelihoods of farming households to improve their socioeconomic status and accommodate the possible shocks occasioned by obvious livelihood dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Abass, K., Afriye, K. and Adomako (2103): Response to Livelihood Transformation in Peri-Urban Kumasi. *Journal of Sustainable Development*. 6 (6):121-136.
- Afriyie, K., Abass, K., and Adomako, J. A. A. (2013): Urbanization of the Rural Landscape: Assessing the Effects in Peri-urban Kumasi. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*.6(1): 45-49.
- Carney, D. (1988). Implementing Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. Approach Paper presented at DFID National Reserve Advisers' Conference. London. Department for International Development (DFID)
- Nigerian Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP) (2017). St Luke's Hospital Gully Erosion Site, Uyo L.G.A., Akwa Ibom State. Final Report November, 2017. Akwa Ibom State Project Management Unit.
- Ayerakwa, H. M. (2017). Planting to feed the city? Agricultural production, food security and multi-spatial livelihoods among urban households in Ghana Lund, Sweden .Recovered from http://portal.research.lu.se/ws/files/25197059/Ayerakwa_2017.pdf on 10/12/2017.
- Cinner, J. E., and Bodin O. (2010). Livelihood Diversification in Tropical Coastal Communities: A Network Based Approach to Analysing 'Livelihood Landscapes'. *Plus One*, 5(8).
- Djurfeldt, A. A., and Jirström, M. (2013). Urbanization and changes in farm size in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia from a geographical perspective, a review of the literature. Background Paper for the ISPC Foresight Study on Farm Size and Urbanization. Available at :< <Http://www.Sciencecouncil.Org/sections/strategy-Trends>
- Dossa, L., Buerkert, A. and Schlect, E. (2011). Cross-Location Analysis of the Impact of Household Socioeconomic Status Participating in Urban Agriculture in West Africa. *Human Ecology Interdisciplinary Journal* 2011.October, 39(5):569-581.
- Ekong, E. E. (2003). Rural Sociology: An introduction and analysis of Rural Nigeria. Dove Educational Publishers, Uyo, Nigeria
- NEWMAP (2017). Nigerian Erosion and Watershed Management Project: Akwa Ibom State Livelihood Needs Assessment and Community Livelihood Plan Report for Etim Umana, Uyo Nigeria.
- Oruonye, E. D. (2013). Grassroots Democracy and the Challenges of Rural Development in Nigerian: A Case study of Bali LGA of Taraba State. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.1(1):12-19
- Satterthwaite, D., McGranahan, G., and Tacoli, C. (2010). Urbanization and its Implication for Food and Farming. Royal Society Publishing. Philadelphia. Transport. Rural. Sociology. B, 365, 2809-2820. Retrieved August 1, 2011, from rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org
- Uwem, C. A. (2016): Access and Utilization of New Media among Urban Livestock Farmers In Akwa Ibom and Benue States of Nigeria. PhD dissertation, Department of Rural Sociology and Extension, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State