Livelihood Status of Households within Igbo-Ora Community of Oyo-State, Nigeria

*Ayinde, Yewande A., Oyesola, O. B. and Oladeji J. O.
Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
*Corresponding author: yewandeayinde@yahoo.com
Tel: 234-7033321439

ABSTRACT
This study examined the livelihood status of households within Igbo-Ora community of Oyo state. Forty households were sampled in each of the five quarters that constitute the study area through systematic random sampling technique to give a total of 200 respondents. Quantitative method was used in gathering data on livelihood abilities, assets and activities for the study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data at 0.05. Results of analysis revealed that 57.0% of respondents had low level of livelihood abilities while, respondents had had high level of access to natural (57.3%), physical (54.0%) and financial capitals (54.0%). Accesses to social and human capital were low for 61.5% and 52.0% respondents respectively, with 60.0% having high level of livelihood activities. Most (55.0%) of the households had low livelihood status. There was a significant difference between the five quarters in terms of their livelihood status (r=0.043). Result of regression shows that livelihood abilities (0.652) and livelihood assets (0.489) contributed more to low respondents' livelihood status. It is concluded that the livelihood status of households within Igbo-Ora is low because of the low livelihood abilities and assets of the respondents which contributed more to the low livelihood status. It is recommended that capacity building activities should be carried out by governmental and non-governmental organisations using extension models to improve abilities to perform economically viable agricultural activities in order to improve their status.

Keywords: Abilities, Assets, Activities and Livelihood status

INTRODUCTION

In developing countries, where majority of families, in both farm and non-farm sectors, derive their livelihoods from agriculture, sustainability of agriculture cannot be discussed or even defined in isolation of the issue of livelihoods. As defined by Ellis (2000a), livelihood is made up of the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities necessary for means of making a living. Abilities do not only include the degree of physical strength or weaknesses, but also knowledge, skills, training and years of experiences in the livelihood activity (Oyesola and Ademola, 2011). Assets are the basic materials or social, tangible or intangible services, resources, skills or attribute. They are the physical, natural, social, financial and human resources that people use for structuring their livelihoods. Activities are said to be strategies in which individuals adopt using the abilities and resources to produce goods and services for the purpose of income earning both monetary and non-monetary. Alternatively, there may be opportunities to diversify into off-farm and non-farm income-earning activities. Basically,

income generating activities are activities performed by individual households, using their abilities that is, knowledge, skills, and years of experience in producing goods and services that are marketable for exchange of money as a source of income, while non- income generating activities are understood in the sense that individual households transforms the group in which they belongs not for earning monetary income but as well exploring their resources towards securing their livelihood.

Rural livelihoods are often vulnerable to risks and shocks, due to climate variability, human and livestock diseases, pests, flooding, unfavourable markets, institutional deficiencies. These can present risks and inhibit livelihood endeavours. Vulnerability refers to both exposures to unfavourable developments like rainfall failure, or livestock loss that would cause considerable harm to one's livelihood; as well as the lack of means to cope with the loss without losing the household's livelihood base (Chambers, 2006).

Household is taken as a unit of reference in this study because it is the most important institution through which population, share income

and consumption (FAO, 2006). The reduction in land access, declining crop yields, seasonality do affect rural farmers livelihood activities which makes them to diversify from their primary occupation of farming to other off-farm such as petty trading, okada riding, bricklaying, and non-farm such as labourer in other person's farm, processing of farm produce, marketing of farm produce as other means for securing their livelihood. But the sustainability of livelihoods from these activities that are expected to redeem them from poverty remains doubtful. Poverty reduction strategies generally aim to improve the asset holdings of the poor, either by endowing them with additional financial human, natural, or social assets. In this context, households' revealed preference among livelihood strategies and the feasible set of strategies among which different households can choose. The study of diversification behaviour offers important insights as to what might be effective in reducing poverty and vulnerability.

This can happen through identification of either effective means of targeting transfers to the poor or the food insecure, or impediments to the smooth functioning of factor markets in labour, land and capital that condition households' on-farm and off-farm investments. Although rural livelihood diversification can be relevant as household farmers diversify from their primary occupation to off-farm earning activities in order to generate savings and invest these funds either in farm-related activities or non-agricultural endeavours as a result of improved food security, increased income and improved well-being. The study assessed the livelihood status of households within Igbo-Ora community by providing answers to the following research questions:

- What are the livelihood capabilities/ abilities of hsouseholds in the study area?
- What are the livelihood assets that households have access to in the study area?
- What livelihood activities do households engaged in the study area?

METHODOLOGY
Area of study
The study was carried out in Igbo-Ora in Ibarapa Central Local Government Area of Oyo-state. Igbo-Ora is bounded in the north by Idere, in the east by Eruwa, in the west by Ogun river, and lies in the derived savannah zone of Oyo state. The annual rainfall is between 70-80cm. Igbo- Ora community has five quarters namely; Ibeerekodo, Sagahun, Paako, Igbole and Idofin.

Population of study
The target population of study were all household-heads that are within Igbo-Ora community of Oyo-State.

Sampling procedure and sample size
Systematic random sampling technique was used to sample 40 respondents each from Ibeerekodo, Sagahun, Paako, Igbole and Idofin quarters within Igbo-Ora resulting in a total number of 200 respondents. This was done by sampling every 10th house from a designated starting point in each of the quarters.

Measurement of variables
Livelihood abilities was measured with a scale of willingness to pursue education(Nominal scale); Skilful activities involved (Ordinal scale); amount of work done (hrs/day-Interval scale); number of active labour (Interval scale); training (Nominal scale-Indigenous-1, Informal-1, Formal-1);years of experience (Interval scale); Sources of finance(Ordinal scale-Self-1, Informal-2, Formal-3); ownership of production(Ordinal scale-Own some-1, Own most-2, Own all-3); and infrastructural support(Ordinal scale-Poor-1, Fair-2, Good-3). The score is then, summed up to give the minimum, maximum and mean scores, while the mean score was used to categorise households into low and high livelihood abilities. Thus, mean and above were categorised as high livelihood abilities and respondents with scores below mean score were categorised as low livelihood abilities.

Livelihood assets were measured with a checklist of quantity and quality of physical, social, human, financial and natural assets. Natural assets- Number and size (Interval scale); Access (Nominal scale-Wet season-1, Dry season-1). Physical assets- Availability (Nominal scale-Yes-1, No-0); Access (Ordinal scale-All the time-4, Most times-3, Sometimes-2, Never-1); State of the facilities (Ordinal scale-Poor-1, Fair-2, Good-3). Social assets-Membership (Nominal scale-Yes-1, No-0); Number of years of membership (Interval scale). Financial assets-Availability (Nominal scale- Yes -1, No-0); Access (Ordinal scale-Always-4, Most times-3, Few times-2, Never-1) Volume of fund(large-3, Average-2, Small-1). Human capital –Educational level (Ordinal scale-Non-formal-1, Primary-2, Secondary-3, Tertiary-4); Contribution to livelihood activity (Ordinal scale-High-3, Average-2, Low-1); Medical treatment (Ordinal scale-Often-1, Rarely-2, Never-3). The mean score for each of capital assets was obtained to sum up total livelihood assets score for each household. The overall assets were calculated through addition of standardized scores of each of the components (natural, physical, social, financial and human capital). Mean score calculated was used to categorise respondents with high or low livelihood assets. Hence, respondents with average mean and above were categorised as

high livelihood assets and below mean score were categorised as low livelihood assets.

Livelihood activities were measured with a scale of income generating activities both agricultural and non-agricultural. Involvement (Nominal scale-Yes-1 No-0), Frequency of involvement (Always-3, Sometimes-2, Never-1), Income earning annually and monthly (Interval scale). The total livelihood activities score for each respondent was obtained from the sum of the mean scores of the respondents' livelihood activities score.

Livelihood status was measured by summing up the total score of livelihood abilities, livelihood assets and livelihood activities. The standard scores for each of the three components were computed. The standard scores for the three variables (livelihood abilities, assets and activities) of each respondent were summed to form composite total scores for livelihood. Total livelihood status for each respondent was obtained from the sum of total mean score of each respondent for the three variables (livelihood abilities, assets and activities) to categorise household as those with high and low livelihood status. Mean score and above were used to categorise respondents with high livelihood status and below mean were used to categorize respondents with low livelihood status.

Data analysis

Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages and means and inferential statistics such as Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Analysis of Variance and regression) were used to analyse data collected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Livelihood abilities

Livelihood abilities were based on amount of work done, number of active labour, training, years of experience, Sources of finance, ownership of production and infrastructural support with respects to respondents prioritized activities as people have combination of activities in order to face sudden shocks. First prioritized activities said to be combination of activities which as shown in table 1 that majority (43.0%) of the respondents worked 6-10 hours/day, 47.0% of respondents had informal training while 48.0% of respondent had 1-10 years of experience. Farming activities said to be their second prioritized activities which is not consistent with Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development Need Assessment Report (2013) findings that farming is regarded as their primary occupation in Igbo-Ora. Majority (34.0%) worked within 1-5 hours/day, 36.0% of respondents worked 4-6 days/weeks, 36.0% with indigenous training. This implies that the farming activities they engaged in, was through inheritance from

fore-fathers since almost all of inhabitant of Igbo-ora practice farming as one of their income generating activities but not their main occupation as shown in result of analysis from table 1 to be their second ranked occupation. Majority (41.5%) of the respondents had 1-10 years of farming experience as well as self source finance (73.0%), own all production (41.0%) while 66.0% had good infrastructural support. Also, the third prioritized activities reveals from table 1 said to be trading as majority (8.0%) of respondents worked 1-5 hours/ day and only 1.5% of the respondents worked 6-10 and above 10 hours/day. Only 5.5% worked 1-3days/week. As majority (5.5%) in the third prioritized activities had indigenous form of training in performing this activity. 3.5% of the respondents had 1-10 years of trading experience and above 40 years respectively. 9.0% of respondents sourced fund individually to finance their trading activities, in addition, 4.5% of the respondents owned all production while 7.0% of the respondents had good infrastructural support on the trading activities. This implies that majority of the respondents had more than one activity they engaged in, for them to earn their living. The limited hours' and days' with respect to average labour is because most respondents distribute their time among various income generating activities, which consequently affect the growth and the development of any of those activities. Since majority of respondents have variety of activities, indigenous and informal training is most prevalent in the community but the majority is said to be indigenous form of training because they diversify to farming activities. Majority source fund by themselves in making their production this is partly because there is no registered formal financial or cooperative institution in which government and NGO's can be of support to better their livelihood.

Table 2 shows that 57.0% had low level of livelihood ability, while 43.0% had high level of ability. This further explained that respondents had low capability to increase their socio-economic status as corroborated Oyesola and Ademola (2011) that Ileogbo residents had low capacity to increase their livelihood activities and socio-economic status. This implies that low livelihood ability had unfavourable influence on their activities which falls back on their socio-economic status. Therefore, there is need for more extension support in terms of capacity building complementing with training in order to improve their knowledge and skills for better livelihood within the households context.

Table 1
Distribution of respondents based on their livelihood abilities

| | Prioritized livelihood activities | | |
| | Combination of activities | Farming | Trading |
Variables	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
Labour (hours/day)			
1-5	49 (24.5)	68 (34.0)	16 (8.0)
6-10	86 (43.0)	58 (29.0)	3 (1.5)
>10	65 (32.5)	28 (14.0)	3 (1.5)
Labour (days/week			
1-3	53 (26.5)	65 (32.5)	11 (5.5)
4-6	120 (60.0)	72 (36.0)	8 (4.0)
>6	27 (13.5)	16 (8.0)	3 (1.5)
Training			
Informal	94 (47.0)	49 (24.5)	8 (4.0)
Formal	37 (18.5)	32 (16.0)	6 (3.0)
Indigenous	69 (34.5)	72 (36.0)	11 (5.5)
Years of experience			
1-10	96 (48.0)	83 (41.5)	7 (3.5)
11-20	49 (24.5)	32 (16.0)	6 (3.0)
21-30	29 (14.5)	27 (13.5)	1 (0.5)
31-40	17 (8.5)	6 (3.0)	1 (0.5)
>40	9 (4.5)	7 (3.5)	7 (3.5)
Sources of finance			
Self	193 (96.5)	146 (73.0)	18 (9.0)
Informal	6 (3.0)	4 (2.0)	3 (1.5)
Formal	1 (0.5)	5 (2.5)	1(0.5)
Ownership of production			
Own some	17 (8.5)	15 (7.5)	6 (3.0)
Own most	76 (38.0)	58 (29.0)	7 (3.5)
Own all	107 (53.5)	82 (41.0)	9 (4.5)
Infrastructural support			
Fair	13 (6.5)	23 (11.5)	8 (4.0)
Good	187 (93.5)	132 (66.0)	14 (7.0)

Table 2
Distribution of respondents based on level of livelihood abilities

	Frequency	Percentage
Low (< 146)	114	57.0
High (≥ 146)	96	43.0
Total	200	100.0

Level of capital assets

The results of analysis as shown in table 3 revealed that 57.5%, 54.0% and 54.0% of the respondents had high level of natural, physical and financial capital respectively while 61.5% and 52.0% of the respondents had low level of social capital and human capital. This indicates that the respondents had access to available land and water because of the farming activities concentrated in the community. This negotiate a balanced access to their physical asset (such as farm tools and where to market the produce) recognizing the natural resource for the purpose of generating income which as a result of boosting their financial assets by making profit from the enterprise and also accessing informal savings groups as a major source of finance in rural communities. This further infers that social capital and human capital were low because religious group and age-grade only contributed to their social life which is not enough because peoples were born in one religion or the other. Ebitigha (2008) states that access to social capital is low, while human capital uncovers the contribution of household member in determining the human assets declines as those members stay apart. The household unit which made the respondents to have low access to human capital as corroborated Oyesola and Ademola (2011) that states that Ile-Ogbo residents had low access to human capital.

Table 3
Distribution of respondents based on their level of capital assets

Variables	Low F (%)	High F (%)	Total F (%)
Natural capital	85 (42.5)	115 (57.5)	200 (100.0)
Physical capital	92 (46.0)	108 (54.0)	200 (100.0)
Social capital	123 (61.5)	77 (38.5)	200 (100.0)
Financial capital	92 (46.0)	108 (54.0)	200 (100.0)
Human capital	104 (52.0)	96 (48.0)	200 (100.0)

Livelihood activities

Result of analysis from table 4 shows that 46.0% of respondents had low level of on-farm livelihood activities, while majority (54.0%) of respondents had high level of on-farm livelihood activities.0.5% had low level of off-farm livelihood activities while majority (99.5%) of the respondents had high level of off-farm livelihood activities. Also 7.5% of respondents had low level of non-farm livelihood activities while majority (92.0%) of respondents had high level non-farm livelihood activities. This further explained that there was a balance in their livelihood activities in Igbo-ora community because majority had high livelihood activities since they diversify to perform combined activities in order to improve household long run resilience in face of adverse trends or sudden shock. This implies that respondents had access to multiple activities which makes them distribute their time on those activities with no concentration on one activity as a means of securing a living.

Table 4
Distribution of respondents based on level of livelihood activities

Variables	Low F (%)	High F (%)	Total F (%)
On-farm activities	92 (46.0)	108 (54.0)	200 (100.0)
Off-farm activities	1 (0.5)	199 (99.5)	200 (100.0)
Non-farm activitie	15 (7.5)	185 (92.5)	200 (100.0)

DFID (2001) stated that livelihood activities are economic activities that people know, own and undertake to earn income today and into the future. Table 5 reveals that 40.0% of the respondents had low level of livelihood activities while 60.0% of

respondents had high level of access. This can be explained by the inherent capabilities and assets undertaken by households which tend to have positive impact on their livelihood activities as corroborated by Ellis (1997) that the processes by which rural families construct a diverse portfolio of activities in their struggle for survival and in order to improve their standards of living. Although it is ascertained that the livelihood abilities of Igbo-ora is low, yet, it can still be effectively utilize with the abundance of their capital assets especially natural capital resulting to high livelihood activities.

Table 5
Distribution of respondent based on their level of livelihood activities

Level of livelihood activities	Frequency	Percentage
Low (< 31)	80	40.0
High (≥ 31)	120	60.0
Total	200	100.0

Livelihood status

This is the position of household on livelihood components such as livelihood abilities, assets and activities. Result of analysis from Table 6 reveals that majority (55.0%) of the respondents had low livelihood status while 44.5% had high livelihood status. This is because majority of the respondents had low level of abilities and assets as this are components of livelihood. Although, majority of respondents had high level of livelihood activities, as this cannot mainly influence the livelihood status since it only for them to make combinations of activities in order to earn income but yet is not sustainable to their livelihood status.

Table 6
Distribution of respondents based on level of livelihood status

Level of livelihood status	Frequency	%
Low	111	55.5
High	89	44.5
Total	200	100.0

Test of difference in livelihood status of Igbo-Ora quarters

Table 7 indicates that there was a significant difference in the livelihood status of households across the five quarters in Igbo-Ora community. The reason that can be explained for this observation can be due to different cultural backgrounds that each of the five segments of Igbo-Ora came from. Results of analysis shows that the significant difference exists because the five quarters had different cultural background, ethnic group and livelihood activities that vary across the quarters, as farming is more prominent in one quarters than the other. Although, Igbo-Ora community seem to be one community but corroborating the qualitative report that people migrated from different places to settle in Igbo-Ora now becoming indigene of the community. This was further explained according to qualitative report that Paako, Igbole and Sagan-un had similar ethnic background while Idofin and Ibeerekodo are from different ethnic group between the quarters but Idofin quarters is mainly Yorubas. Other quarters had Igbos, Hausas, Fulani and Ghanaians as long-term migrants. These migrants had no access to natural capital especially land, which prompted some of them to go on lease for farming activities contributing to the significant difference in their livelihood. However, similarity exists between Paako, Igbole and Sagan-un on their socio-economic status but yet, majority are better-off than average in Igbole quarter has this may influence their livelihood status. This is because their background differs from one another, as it influences their abilities on their activities towards better livelihood status.

Table 7
Analysis of Variance of the Difference in the livelihood status of households between the five quarters in the study

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Decision
Between Groups	70949.067	4	17737.267	2.508	0.043	S
Within Groups	1379220.394	195	7072.925			
Total	1450169.461	199				

P> 0.05= not significant (NS)   F=F statistics

Regression analysis of abilities, assets and activities on livelihood status

Result of analysis on Table 8 shows that livelihood assets, livelihood abilities contributed more to livelihood status of Igbo-Ora community at the rate of 0.489 and 0.652 respectively. Only livelihood activities had lesser (0.024) contribution to livelihood status. This implies that abilities and

assets should be build upon in terms of hours spent on their activities per day in order to have a lesser time spent towards promoting their livelihood status. Also, social capital in terms of social networking within the community should be build upon likewise the number of children in the household unit as they put more weight on the household expenses but also providing a means

of labour force to the household for an improved livelihood status. As capacity building assets and abilities restructures the transforming structure of livelihood activities as a one of the livelihood component that contributes to the development of the community since respondents had a multiple portfolios towards its sustainability for better livelihood.

Table 8
Contribution of livelihood abilities, livelihood assets and livelihood activities to livelihood status

Variables	Beta	T	Sig
Constant		0.000	1.000
Livelihood assets	0.489	3.8E + 008	0.000
Livelihood activities	0.024	20857686	0.000
Livelihood abilities	0.652	5.3E + 008	0.000

R= 1.000[a]; R^2=1.000; Adjusted R^2=1.000; Std. Error= 0.00000; Sig at 0.05

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the followings conclusions are hereby drawn:

- Livelihood abilities of respondents are low in terms of inadequate knowledge and skills on their income generating activities which contributed more to low livelihood status. Also, their labour in terms of hours/day and days/week tends to limit their activities production as majority distribute their time on multiple activities they involved.
- Respondents' level of access to livelihood assets is low because majority had high access to natural, financial and physical capitals while low social and human capitals contributed more to low livelihood status.
- Respondents are involved in agricultural and non-agricultural activities as this influences their high level of livelihood activities within Igbo-Ora community. There are diverse portfolios in Igbo-Ora in which respondents were engaged and they have additional portfolios to their primary occupation which means livelihood diversification in order to cope with insufficiencies and uncertainties.
- Respondents' livelihood status differs across the five quarters within Igbo-Ora..
- Livelihood assets and abilities contributed more to low livelihood status.

The following recommendations are hereby made based on the above conclusions;

- Provision of capacity building training, in terms of workshops and extension services in order to improve their abilities (knowledge and skill) towards better livelihood outcome.
- Mobilization of the community members into social groups to improve their rights, claims or access to capital assets, customers' relation, which also serve as form of social network in promoting livelihood.
- Capacity building of programme should be livelihood activity specific because of diversity and diversification of livelihood.

REFERENCES

Bryceson, D. F. 91999) African rural labour, income diversification and livelihood approaches. A long term Sdevelopment perspective. *Review of African PoliticalEconomy* Vol.80(1): 171–189

Chambers, R., and G. Conway. (1992) Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Pratical Concepts for The 21st century. Institute of Development Studies (IDS) Discussion Paper 296. Brighton, Sussex, UK. 9p

Department of Agricultural Extension Rural Development (2013) Interim College of Medicine-Igboora Needs Assessment Report. 3-4

Department for International Development (DFID) (2001) Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets Section2. London. From <http:www.livelihoods. org/info/guidance_sheets_pdfs/section2.pdf> (Retrieved on 27 January, 2010).

Ebitigha O. (2008) *Effects of Livelihood Diversificationon Rural Households Socio-economic Status in Osun State, Nigeria*. M.Sc. Thesis, Unpublished.Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Ellis, F. (1997) Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification. Paper submitted to the Journal of Development Studies.

Ellis, F. (2000a) Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ellis F. (2000b). The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* Vol. 51(2): 289-302

Ellis, F., Kutengule, M., and A. Nyasulu (2003) Livelihoods and rural poverty reduction in Malawi. *World Development* Vol.31(9), 1495-1510.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) (2006) The state of food insecurity in the World. *FAO Policy Brief* June (2) Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation.

Oyesola,O.B and A.O, Ademola (2011) Livelihood in University of Ibadan Social Laboratory in Ileogbo Community of Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology* Vol. 34(2): 91-100

Little, Peter D., Kevin Smith, Barbara A. Cellarius, D. Layne Coppock and Christopher B. Barrett (2001) "Avoiding Disaster: Diversification and Risk Management among East African Herders," *Development and Change*