

CONTRIBUTION OF SMALL SCALE POULTRY FARMING TO POVERTY REDUCTION IN OYUN AND OFFA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS OF KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

Akangbe J. A¹., Awotoye O. A¹., *Komolafe S.E¹. and Ajibola B.O².

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

²Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Technology, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria

*Corresponding author:- kemmas04@yahoo.com

This study investigated the contribution of small scale poultry farming to poverty reduction in Oyun and Offa local government of Kwara State. 194 Small scale Poultry farmers were selected using a two-stage random technique. Descriptive statistical technique and Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC) were used to analyze the data. The results revealed that majority (62.4%) of the respondents were married, more than half (59.3%) were male with the mean age of 35.5years. The average period of poultry keeping experience was 7 years. The effect of income on poverty reduction revealed that it has highly contributed to the purchase of food stuff for the family, payment of their children's school fees, and payment of house rent of 79.4%, 27.8%, and 42.8% of the respondents, respectively. Product Moment Correlation revealed that only the level of education ($r= 0.182^*$, $p= 0.011$) of the farmers showed a significant relationship with the extent to which egg and meat has contributed to respondents' income. The result showed a significant relationship between the income and selected effect of income made (purchase of foodstuff for the family ($r=0.149^*$, $p=0.038$) the payment of children school fees ($r= 0.204^{**}$, $p= 0.004$), payment of rents ($r= 0.159^*$, $p= 0.027$) and purchase of furniture($r= 0.161^*$, $p= 0.025$) in reducing the farmers poverty. The study thus concludes that savings made from small scale poultry farming were not enough to meet the needs of farmers, the effect of income on their poverty reduction has highly contributed to the purchase of food stuff for the family, the payment of their children's

school fees and payment of house rent. The study recommends among others, the need for farmers to increase their flock sizes for more income and Government should help to subsidize and make readily available the vaccines, drugs, feeds and poultry equipment to reduce their cost of production. **Key words:** Small scale, Poultry farming, Poverty reduction, Kwara State.

Despite the Millennium Development Goals that the international community has pledged to achieve by the year 2015, poverty remains ubiquitous in many parts of the world. The poor are often considered as those earning below a particular income recognized as minimum amount needed to provide the basic necessity for a living. This is put at US\$275 and US\$370 per annum for the extreme poor and for the moderate poor respectively (Levy, 1991).

Poverty reduction improves the quality of life of the people and provides them with the means to acquire and maintain their basic needs but the country remains vulnerable to hunger and poverty. More than 60 percent of Nigerians are living on less than US\$1 per day (World Bank, 2003). According to Oguntola (2008), the country ranked 20 on the 2006 Global Hunger Index (GHI). Similarly, the nation's rank in the Human Development Index (HDI) remains low, being the 152nd out of 175 countries (Ijaya, 2008). The low HDI score reflects the situation of poor access to basic social services in the country (UNDP, 2004).

Approximately 75% of the world's poor live in rural areas. For most of these people, livestock are an important part of their

livelihood. Animal production in general and chickens in particular play important socioeconomic roles in developing countries (Alders, 2004; Salam, 2005). Animals have many different functions; they produce important food products and fertilizer, they are a source of income, they provide draught power; and they also fulfill banking and insurance functions. Small animals in particular require minimal investment on the part of poor livestock keepers. They can be kept in the vicinity of the house or on common land, and fed with “residue” from agricultural production.

The poultry industry plays a major role in food production in the livestock sub-sector of the Nigerian economy. Small scale poultry production is practiced by most rural households throughout the developing world; despite the fact that its contribution to livelihoods appears to be of little nominal value when observed by researchers and other outsiders. Small scale poultry contribute significantly to food security, poverty alleviation and the ecologically sound management of natural resources. Moreover, small scale poultry constitute an important component of the agricultural and household economy in the developing world, a contribution that goes beyond direct food production as well as employment and income generation for small farmers, especially women (Guèye, 2000).

The Ministry of Agriculture and National Resource (1998) and Eduvie (2002) stated that Nigerian poultry industry is dominated by small-holder farmers who on the aggregate raise bulk of the birds for egg production and meat, but individually rear less than 1000 birds using different production strategies in consonance with little resources available to them. Small scale poultry are owned by almost all poor households in developing countries and are thought to be an excellent tool in poverty alleviation due to their quick turnover and low investment requirement. Small poultry production represents an important system for supplying the fast growing human population with high quality protein and providing additional income to resource-poor small farmers, especially women (Guèye, 2009).

Despite the acknowledge importance of poultry production Akanni (2007) opined that it is characterized by low production level due to limited finance for the procurement of basic poultry equipment and materials coupled with unfriendly government policies are the major hurdles to the overall performance of poultry producers.

The study therefore looks at the contributions of small scale poultry farming in poverty reduction using Oyun and Offa Local Government Areas of Kwara State as a case study. The specific objectives describe the socio-economic characteristics of small scale poultry farmers, examine the extent to which poultry products has contributed to farmers' income, examine the income made by small scale poultry farmers and investigate the effect of income made in the reducing the poverty of small scale poultry farmers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study area covered the poultry farmers in Offa and Oyun local government areas of Kwara State, Nigeria. Offa town is located some 250 kilometers from Lagos and 500 kilometers from Abuja, the Federal Capital of Nigeria and on Latitude North 8° 25' and Longitude East 4° 30' of the Equator. The town is situated in the transition zone between the forest and savanna regions of Nigeria. Presently, the town is the headquarters of Offa Local Government Area of Kwara State, and has an estimated population (by 1991 census figures) of about 350,113 people (Emielu 1991; NPC 1993). Oyun local government is located in the Guinea savanna vegetation belt. It is divided into eleven political wards for administrative convenience. These include Ipee, Igosun, Ira, Erin- Ile North, Erin-Ile South, Ijagbo, Ilemona, Ojoku, Ikotun, Aho- Igbada and Igbomina wards.

A multistage random sampling was used to arrive at the sample size. The first stage involved the random selection of five (5) wards in Oyun Local Government while five (5) wards were also selected in Offa Local Government Area. The second stage involved a random selection of twenty (20) small scale poultry farmers in five (5) wards

selected both in Oyun and Offa Local Government Area respectively. A total number of two hundred (200) small scale poultry farmers were used for the study.

Data for the study was collected with the aid of structured questionnaire and interview schedule. Collected data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean and Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC).

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

Data analysis in Table 1 revealed that more than half (59.3%) of the respondents were male while 40.7% were female. This does not conform to the study by Okitoil et al. (2007) which revealed that poultry farming is a popular activity among rural women in most countries. Further result of the analysis shows that about 38.1% of the respondents were between the ages of 31-40 years, majority (62.4%) of which were married. This suggests that respondents were of age, matured, responsible and could make decisions on their own. Results from the study revealed that 34.5 percent of the farmers had household size of between 7 and 9 members. A handful (28.4%) of them had adult education with about 34.0 percent of respondents having experience between 7 – 9 years in poultry farming.

Findings shows in table 2 that majority (79.4%) of the farmers indicated the extent at which egg contributed to their income is very great, majority (88.7%) of the respondents further reveals that the extent of income generation from chicken (meat) is very great. About 60.3% of the respondents attested that eggshell contributed nothing to their income generation. Similarly, poultry droppings and feathers contributed at no extent to income generation as indicated by (52.2%) and 72.2% of the respondent respectively. This implies that respondents sell more of egg and chicken (meat) products to generate income.

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents (n= 194)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)		
21 – 30	19	9.8
31 – 40	74	38.1
41 – 50	66	34.0
51 – 60	25	12.9
61 and above	10	5.2
Gender		
Male	115	59.3
Female	79	40.7
Marital Status		
Single	39	20.1
Married	121	62.4
Divorced	24	12.4
Widowed	10	5.2
Level of Education		
No formal Education	45	23.2
Adult Education	55	28.4
Primary Education	52	26.8
Secondary Education	22	11.3
Tertiary Education	20	10.3
Household size (people)		
Less than 3	16	8.2
4 – 6	44	22.7
7 – 9	67	34.5
10 – 12	46	23.7
Greater than 12	21	10.8
Year of Experience		
Less than 4	19	9.8
4 – 6	61	31.4
7 – 9	66	34.0
10 – 12	31	16.0
Greater than 12	17	8.8

Source: Field survey, 2013

Extent at which poultry products contributed to income generation

Table 2. Extent at which poultry products contributed to income generation (n=194)

Poultry products	Frequency	Percentage
Egg		
Very great	154	79.4
Great extent	39	20.1
Low extent	1	0.5
Meat (chicken)		
Very great	172	88.7
Great extent	21	10.8
Low extent	1	0.5
Egg shell		
Great extent	2	1.0
Low extent	75	38.7
No extent	117	60.3
Poultry droppings		
Great extent	14	7.2
Low extent	71	36.6
No extent	109	52.2
Feathers		
Low extent	54	27.8
No extent	140	72.2

Source: Field survey, 2013

Number of birds kept by small scale poultry farmers

Table 3 revealed birds size of respondent, deduction shows that 13.9% of respondents were raising less than 200birds, 35.6% having between 201- 400birds, 32.0% have between 401-600birds, 11.3% were raising between 601- 800birds and 7.2% of the farmers kept not less than 800birds. This implies that majority (81.5%) of the respondents were raising below 600 birds as the time of this research. According to Akanni (2007) most small-scale poultry farmers have limited finance to raise larger number of flocks.

Table 3. Number of birds kept by small scale poultry farmers

Number of Birds	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 200	27	13.9
201 – 400	69	35.6
401 – 600	62	32.0
601 – 800	22	11.3
801 – 1000	14	7.2

Source: Field survey, 2013

Income from poultry farming and sufficiency of savings to meet respondents needs.

Table 4 shows the results of annual income from poultry farming among respondents, table 4 revealed that 39.2% earned between (₦) 100,000-250,000 per year, 36.1% indicated between (₦) 251,000-500,000, 20.1% indicated that they realized less than (₦) 100,000 while very few (4.6%) indicated a sum greater than (₦) 500,000 as their annual income. This finding agree with Akanni (2007) who stated small scale poultry farmers are characterized with that low income from poultry business.

Majority (75.8%) of the respondents indicated on Table 5 that the savings made on their small scale poultry farming is not enough to meet their needs while 24.2% of the respondents indicated that the savings made were enough to meet their needs. This implies that livelihood of respondents is still sustained with poultry business and poverty is barely reduced by keeping poultry birds among respondents.

Table 4. Income realized by farmers from small scale poultry (n=194)

Annual Income (Naira)	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 100,000	39	20.1
100,000 – 250,000	76	39.2
251,000 – 500,000	70	36.1
Greater than 500,000	9	4.6

Source: Field survey, 2013

Table 5. Sufficiency of savings to meet their needs (n=194)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	47	24.2
No	147	75.8

Source: Field survey, 2013

Contributions of poultry income to Household needs

Data analysis in table 6 revealed that majority (79.4%) of the respondents indicated that income from their small scale poultry farming has highly contributed to the purchase of food stuff for the family. The implication of the result is that majority of

the farmers use the money they obtain from poultry farming to feed their family, suggesting the contribution of poultry to their poverty reduction is high. It further shows that 68.6% of the respondents declared that it has contributed fairly to the payment of their children's school fees. About 41.8% of the respondents indicated that it has fairly contributed to payment of medical fees. Above half (55.7%) of the respondents indicated that it has not contributed to their purchase of building materials. The result shows that more than half (53.1%) of the respondents indicated that income from their small scale poultry farming has fairly contributed to the payment of house rent. Majority (68.6%) of the respondents indicated that income from their small scale poultry farming has fairly contributed to the purchase of furniture.

Majority (61.3%) of the respondents indicated that it has no contribution to their purchase of electronics. Provision of meat for the family accounted for 61.3% of the respondents attesting to it as highly contributed to the provision of meat for the family. For the entertainment of guest, 55.2% of the respondents indicated it has fairly contributed. Majority (66.0%) of the respondents indicated that it has highly contributed to the provision of meat for special ceremonies. These were in agreement with the (FAO, 2006) research that small scale poultry generated about 53% of the total income, which was used for food, school fees and expected expenses such as medicines.

The result of the analysis on table 7 revealed that only the level of education (0.182*) of the farmers showed a significant relationship with the extent to which egg and meat has contributed to farmers' income at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that as level of education of farmers' increase the extent to which egg and meat contributed to their poverty reduction increases. This could be due to the fact that literacy exposes farmers to different ways to improving and managing their poultry better to give maximum output of egg and meat from which they generate income to lessen the effects of poverty thereby improving their livelihood.

Table 6. Contributions of poultry income to poverty reduction (n=194)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Purchase of foodstuff	154	79.4
Highly contributed	40	20.6
Fairly contributed		
Payment of medical fees	71	36.6
Highly contributed	81	41.8
Fairly contributed	42	21.6
No contribution		
Payment of children's school fees	54	27.8
Highly contributed	133	68.6
Fairly contributed	7	3.6
No contribution		
Purchase of building materials	11	5.7
Highly contributed	75	38.7
Fairly contributed	108	55.7
No contribution		
Payment of house rent	83	42.8
Highly contributed	103	53.1
Fairly contributed	8	4.1
No contribution		
Purchase of furniture	25	12.9
Highly contributed	133	68.6
Fairly contributed	36	18.6
No contribution		
Purchase of electronics	16	8.2
Highly contributed	59	30.4
Fairly contributed	7	3.6
No contribution		
Provision of meat for the family	119	61
Highly contributed	57	29.4
Fairly contributed	18	9.3
No contribution		
Entertainment of guest	76	39.2
Highly contributed	107	55.2
Fairly contributed	11	5.7
No contribution		
Provision of meat for special ceremonies	128	66.0
Highly contributed	42	21.6
Fairly contributed	0	
No contribution		

Source: Field survey, 2013

The findings further revealed that there was no significant relationship at 0.01 and 0.05

level of significance between the genders; marital status, age and years of experience of the respondents the extent to which egg and meat has contributed to their poverty reduction therefore, the null hypothesis HO_1 was accepted that there was no significant relationship between selected socio-economic characteristics (genders; marital status, age and years of experience) and the extent to which egg and meat has contributed to respondents' income.

Among the contribution of income from small scale poultry farming to reducing the poverty of farmers on table 8, purchase of foodstuff for the family (0.149*), payment of rents (0.159*) and purchase of furniture (0.161*) were found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that parts of income realized on poultry were spent on food and shelter for the family. The payment of children school fees (0.204**) showed a significant relationship with the income from poultry at 0.01 level of significance. This could be because majority of the respondents were educated and knows the value of education, they endeavor to send and pay their children school fees. On the other hand, payment of medical fees, purchase of electronics and provision of meat for the family were found to show no significant relationship at 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance with the income realized from poultry farming therefore, the null hypothesis HO_2 is accepted that there is no significant relationship between the income and selected effect of income made (payment of medical fees, purchase of electronics and provision of meat for the family) on poverty reduction of the farmers.

Table 7: Correlation between selected socio-economic characteristics (genders; marital status, age and years of experience) and the extent to which egg and meat has contributed to respondents' income.

Socio-economic Characteristics	Extent of Contribution
<i>Gender</i>	-0.092 (0.201)
<i>Marital status</i>	-0.018 (0.806)
<i>Age</i>	0.063 (0.382)
<i>Level of Education</i>	0.182*(0.011)
<i>Year of Experience</i>	0.032(0.656)

* Significant at Alpha level 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Table 8. Correlation between the income made by the farmers and the effect of income made in reducing the poverty of small scale poultry farmers.

Effect of income on poverty reduction	Income from poultry farming
Purchase of foodstuff	0.149* (0.038)
Payment of children school fees	0.204** (0.004)
Payment of medical fees	0.045 (0.533)
Payment of rents	0.159* (0.027)
Purchase of electronics	0.090 (0.213)
Purchase of furniture	0.161* (0.025)
Provision of meat for the family	0.072 (0.317)

* Significant at Alpha level 0.05 level (2 tailed)

** Significant at Alpha level 0.01 level (2 tailed); the figures in parenthesis are p-values

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings the study thus concludes that: The extent at which egg and chicken (meat) has contributed to farmers' income is very great. The farmers with an average of not greater than 400 birds as their flock size generating an annual income on the average not above (₹) 250,000 per year. Though, savings made from their small scale poultry keeping were not enough to meet their needs but had contributed significantly in the area of purchase of food stuff for the family, the payment of their children's school fees, payment of house rent and purchase of furniture among respondents. The study recommends that farmers should increase their flock sizes for more income. Government should help to subsidize and make readily available the vaccines, drugs, feeds and poultry equipment to reduce their cost of production. Policy should be formulated by government to introduce poultry production as a trade in secondary schools to boost agricultural production as it

plays a very important role in the livelihoods of those people keeping them and their household.

REFERENCES

1. Akanni, I.A. (2007). Effect of micro-Finance on Small Scale Poultry business in South Western Nigeria. *Emirate Journal of Food and Agriculture*, 19(2), 38-47.
2. Alders R (2004). Poultry for profit and pleasure. FAO Diversification Booklet 3, Rome.
3. Eduvie, L. O. (2002). Poultry Production as an Important Component of Nigeria's Livestock Subsector. A Training Manual, National Training Workshop on Poultry Production in Nigeria in NAPRI, ABU, Shika, Zaria, Nigeria.
4. Federal Ministry of Agriculture Water Resources and Rural Development (1998). *Agricultural Policy for Nigeria* FMARRD Publications.
5. Food and Agricultural Organization (2006). High Bird Flu In Africa After Outbreak In Nigeria". <http://www.fao.org/newsroom/en/news/2006/1000226/Index.html>. Downloaded on 21/05/2013
6. Guèye, E.F. (2000). The role of family poultry in poverty alleviation, food security and the promotion of gender equality in rural Africa. *Outlook on Agriculture* 29(2), 129-136.
7. Guèye, E.F. (2009). The role of networks in information dissemination to family poultry farmers. *World's poultry science journal*, 65, 115-123.
8. Ijaiya, G. (2008). Estimating the Rate of Absolute Poverty for National Development in Saliu, H. A. and Jimoh, H. I (eds) *Perspectives o Nation - Building and Development in Nigeria: Environmental and Economic Issues*. Concept Publications Ltd Lagos Nigeria. pp 164 – 175.
9. Levy, S. (1991). Poverty Alleviation in Mexico. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 679.
10. Oguntola, S. (2008). Food insecurity More Evident and Nigeria is no Exception Nigerian Tribune Tuesday 18 2008,
11. Okitoi, L. O., Ondwasy, H. O., Obali, M. P. and Murekefu, F. (2007). Gender Issues in Poultry Production in Rural Households of Western Kenya, *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.*, 19:Art17.
12. Salam, k. (2005). Improvement of village chicken production in a mixed (chicken-ram) farming system in Burkina Faso. Ph.D Thesis. Wageningen Institute of Animal Sciences, Animal Nutrition Group, Wageningen University, the Netherlands.
13. United Nation Development Programme (2004). *Millenium Development Goals. Human Development Report 2004* New York. Oxford University Press.
14. World Bank (2003). *World Bank Development Indicators 2003* The World Bank Washington D.C