

Impact of 2011 Post- Election Violence on the Income of Rural Farmers In Southern Senatorial Zone, Kaduna State

^aOnwuaroh, A.S*, ^bAdejoh, S.O., ^aPanwal, E.F. and ^cAliyu, M.K.

^aDepartment of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Federal University of Kashere, Gombe

^bDirector General, Bureau of Public Procurement, Room 004, New State Secretariat, Lokoja, Kogi State.

^cDepartment of Extension and Economics, National Agricultural Extension Research and Liaison Services, ABU Zaria.

*Corresponding Email: augustinesundaysimon@gmail.com

Abstract

This study assessed the impact of 2011 post-election violence on the income of rural farmers in southern senatorial zone, Kaduna State. The specific objectives include describing the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, examining the level of damage of farmers' assets and determining the impact of the post-election violence on the income of the farmers. A multi-stage sampling procedure was employed to select 300 farmers used for the study. Primary data were collected with the aid of a well-structured interview schedule and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Findings indicate that 67% of the respondents were males; the majority (82%) were married with a mean household size of 7 persons. The majority (90%) had one form of formal education or the other. About 29% of the respondents lost their farming implements, while about 7% lost their loved ones to death as a result of the post-election violence. The mean annual income of the respondents in 2011(N290733.30) was lower than their mean annual income in 2014(N398266.70). The Chow-test analysis indicated an F-calculated value (4.15) which was statistically significant at 5% level of probability; meaning the post-election violence have negative impact on the income of the farmers. The study recommends that the affected communities should be assisted financially to overcome the adverse effects of post-election violence.

Keywords: assets, income, post-election, rural farmers, violence,

1.0 Introduction

The fear of insecurity in Nigeria has escalated at an alarming rate and has been compounded by the rising waves of terrorism and kidnapping in recent times (Ali (2013). The Northern part of the country has witnessed several violent clashes claiming lives and properties worth billions of naira and, no doubt, have negatively affected the education, infrastructure, health, economic and other social necessities in the area (Tukur, 2011). The outbreak of violence and the resultant displacement is in part attributed to inflammatory statements made by political leaders during public discourses in the media before, during, and after the elections (Patricia, 2011). According to Igbuzor (2010), electoral violence is: "any act of violence perpetrated in the course of political activities, including pre, during and post-election periods, and may include any of the following acts: thuggery, use of force to disrupt political meetings or voting at polling stations, or the use of dangerous weapons to intimidate voters and other electoral

process or to cause bodily harm or injury to any person connected with electoral processes". Ezeibe (2013) examined the relationship between hate speech and post-election violence in Africa. Drawing most of his illustrations from Nigeria and Kenya, he argued that the seed of hate speech campaign has escalated in Africa, but the phenomenon is mostly understudied and underreported. The report by Centre for Information Technology and Development (CITAD) (2015) shows that 70percent of the people disseminating hate speech in the Nigerian social media space use their identity and can be reached for follow-up actions.

Post-election violence has an immense effect on agriculture, human and other natural resources. The combined effects of disruptions to the agricultural flow of goods, farmland preparation, farm management activities and farm conservation ultimately contribute to declining in agricultural profit margins (Chedotumet *al.*, 2013). Disaggregating the influence of the conflict on production from other factors such as

weather and commodity prices can be difficult, but it still seems clear that violent conflict has severe and real impacts on production (Zaur, 2006). According to Fischer (2002), an electoral process is an alternative to violence as it is a means of achieving governance. It is when an electoral process is perceived as unfair, unresponsive or corrupt that its political legitimacy is compromised and stakeholders are motivated to go outside the established norms to achieve their objectives. Apart from the seminal work of Anifowose (1982) in violence and politics in Nigeria which partly devoted meticulous attention on post-election violence in the western Nigeria during the first republic, the incident of post-election violence has not been significantly studied. Given the destabilizing role that the post-election violence played in the lives of rural Farmers in Southern Senatorial zone of Kaduna State, it is essential to examine the extent to which the income of the victims was affected. Thus, the study investigated the impact of post-election violence on the income of farmers in the southern senatorial zone of Kaduna State, using the 17th April 2011 presidential election as a case study.

The specific objectives are to:

Describe the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers in the study area; Examine the level of damage to farmers' assets during post-election violence and Determine the impact of post-election violence on the income of the farmers in the study area.

H_0 =Post election violence has no significant effect on the farmers' income in southern senatorial zone of Kaduna State.

2.0 Methodology

Description of the Study Area

Kaduna State was created in 1967, and it occupies about 46,061 square kilometres, which represent about five per cent of the land area of the 923,768 square kilometres of Nigeria. The state is made up of twenty-three Local Government Areas. The projected population of the State is 7,037,153 people using 3.2 percent national population growth rate. The State lies between latitude 11° 32' and 09° 02' North of the equator and 8° 50' and 06° 15' East prime meridian. It shares borders with Abuja, Katsina, Kano, Zamfara, Nasarawa, Plateau, Niger and Bauchi. The state has two vegetations- the

Northern Guinea Savanna and Southern Guinea Savanna (KADP, 2007).

The soils are sandy loam. The mean annual temperature varies between 24°C and 27°C. The wet season usually lasts for about three months (May – October) with considerable variation as one moves northwards. Rainfall is more substantial in the southern part of the State, with an average of 1,524mm than in the extreme northern part, with an average of 1,016mm. Many people in the State are engaged in agricultural production activities, and farmers usually carry out these activities with family labour, and it is dependent on the household size (KADP, 2007). Crops mostly grown in the state include maize, sorghum, millet, rice, acha, groundnut, cowpea, yam, cocoyam, potatoes, cassava and sugarcane, among others (KADP, 2007). The people in the state rear livestock chickens, ducks, goats, sheep and pigs on small, medium and large scales (NBS, 2005). Kaduna State consists of Hausa, Gbagyi, Ham, Atyap and Bajjuu ethnic communities. Hausa language is prominent out of the 57 languages spoken in Kaduna state.

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

A multi-stage sampling procedure was employed to select the farmers for the study. In the first stage, four (Jaba, ZangoKataf, and Jema'a, Local Government Areas) out of the 23 Local Government Areas of Kaduna State, were purposively selected. The selection was based on the prominence of post-election crises in the areas. In the second stage, three towns were purposively selected (one from each Local Government Area) based on the high intensity of damage inflicted on the farmers during post-election violence. In the third stage, one hundred respondents were randomly selected from each town, thus, hence, a total of 300 respondents were selected and used for the study. Primary data were collected with the aid of a structured interview schedule. Descriptive and Chow-Test Statistics were used in data analysis.

The Chow test tells you if the regression coefficients are different for split data sets. Basically, it tests whether one regression line or two separate regression lines best fit a split set of data. It is mathematically represented as:

$$chow = \frac{(RSSR - SSR1 - SSR2) / k}{(SSR1 + SSR2) / n - 2k}$$

Where;

Chow statistics

$RSSR$ = the sum of squared residuals from a linear regression in which income of farmers in the year 2011 of the post-election violence and in the year 2014 after the post-election violence were assumed to be the same, the income has dimension k , and there are n observations in total.

SSR_1 = the sum of squared residuals from a linear regression of income of sample 1

SSR_2 = the sum of squared residuals from a linear regression of income of sample 2.

The total number of observation is $n = n_1 + n_2$, and the number of parameters is k .

3.0 Results and Discussion

Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 show that the majority (67%) of the respondents were males, while about 33% were females. More males in the study area would mean more forces available to serve as a form of defence in times of violence. About 39% of the respondents were between the age ranges of 41-50 years, about 21% of the respondents were within the age range of 31-40 years and 21-30 years respectively. The mean age of the respondents was 42 years. It shows that most of the respondents were relatively young within

the active and productive age group and are expected to be strong enough to withstand threats imposed by intruders.

Over 80% of the respondents were married. The mean household size of the respondents was seven (7) persons. It shows that most of the respondents have relatively large household sizes. Large household sizes might provide the workforce required for farm work but on the other way round, it could mean high expenditure on meeting the basic needs of the family. This could predispose the respondents to poverty (Adebo and Ajiboye, 2014). Also, 28% of the participants completed primary school, 22% had secondary education, and 17% had tertiary education. It can be affirmed that most of the respondents are literate. Education helps to enlighten people on their privileges and rights in the society. It implies that most of the respondents would be aware of their rights and therefore, fight against any form of infringement on their rights. Out of the 300 respondents, 62% of them had farm sizes ranging between 3-6 hectares. This further implies that majority of the respondents were medium scale farmers and as such would have more output and income. More income will make the farmers have better access to the media and this will further increase the awareness on voting rights which if violated could result to violence

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

Items	Frequency	Mean	Percentage
Sex			
Male	200		66.7
Female	300		33.3
Age(years)			
21-30	63		21.0
31-40	63	42	21.0
41-50	116		38.7
51-60	58		19.3
Marital Status			
Single	16		5.3
Married	246		82.0
Widow	21		7.0
Widower	11		3.7
Divorce	6		2.0
Household size			
1-5	121		40.3
6-10	160	7	53.3
11-15	19		6.3
Educational status			
No formal education	29		9.7
Adult	70		23.3
Primary	84		28.0
Secondary	67		22.3
Post-Secondary	50		16.7
Farm size(ha)			
1-2	15		5.0
2.1-3	99		33.0
3.1-4	117		39.0
4.1-5	54		18.0
5.1-6	15		5.0

Source: Field survey (2014)

Farmers' Assets damaged via post-election violence

In examining the level of damage done to farmers' assets, Table 2 reveals that 3%, 15%, 29%, 29%, 10%, and 7% of the respondents lost their cars, houses-shops, farming implement,

bicycles and farm produce respectively to post-election violence. Also, 7% of the respondents claimed their loved ones died due to post-election violence. It shows that post-election violence negatively affected the welfare of the respondents.

Table 2: Distribution of Assets Lost as a Result of the post-election Violence

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Types of assets lost		
Cars	9	3.0
Houses	45	15.0
Shops	87	29.0
Farming implements	87	29.0
Bicycles	30	10.0
Farm produce	21	7.0
Lives	21	7.0
Total	300	100

Source: field survey (2014)

Impact of the 2011 Post-election Violence on the Income of Farmers

The study used Chow-test statistics to determine the Impact of the 2011 post-election violence on the income of the farmers. Table 3 shows the calculated annual mean income (average of the monthly income of the respondents) for years 2011 and 2014 to be 290733.30 and 398266.70, respectively. The mean annual income of the respondents for years 2011 was lower than that of the year 2014. It shows that there was a reduction in the income of the respondents in the election period. It agrees with the finding of

Table 3: Calculated annual mean income

Years	Calculated mean annual income of the respondents (N)
2011	290733.30
2014	398266.70

Source: Field survey (2014)

Thompson (2010), which indicates that the economy of the people suffers in an atmosphere of insecurity and political instability. In determining the impact of the post-election violence on the income of farmers, the F-chow value estimate in Table 4 was 4.15, which was statistically significant at 5percent level of probability. It implies there was instability in the income across 2011 and 2014. Thus, election violence had a negative impact on the income of the respondents. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypothesis.

Table 4: Chow-test outcome

RSSR	SSR ₁	SSR ₂	F-Calculated	F-Tabulated at 5% significance level
15260.10	8041.21	780.56	4.15	1.97

Source: Field survey (2014)

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations**Conclusion**

The post-election violence has negative effects on the assets, output and income of the farmers. If election violence is not controlled in Nigeria, more lives and properties will be lost, and this will further impoverish the rural people who are mostly victims of election violence.

Recommendations

The study recommends that Government, non-governmental organizations and wealthy private individuals should assist the communities affected by election violence financially. The assistance could come through subsidizing farming inputs and implements to encourage them revert back to agricultural production. This will encourage the victims to engage more in agriculture which is their primary means of livelihood.

References

- Abati, R. (2011). "For the Attention of General Buhari," *The Guardian*. April 22.
<http://www.odili.net/news/source/2011/apr/22/8.html>. Accessed on 28th March 2012.
- Adebo G.Mand Ajiboye A. (2014).Comparative Analysis of Poverty Level among Rural and Urban Farmers in Ekiti and Ondo States.*Journal of Developing Countries Studies.The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE)*. 4 (20):23-27
- Adegbuyi, A. (2010). Provocative Discourse and Violence in Nigeria's 2011 Elections. *The Africa Portal backgrounder series*.Vol. 17: 1-5
- Akinyemi, S.D. (1998). Status, Problems and Prospects of Rural Land Tenure in Kaduna State and some reflection on Land Tenure Policies in Nigeria. An unpublished PhD Thesis, Cornell University, U.S.A. PP.75.
- Ali, A. D. (2013). Security and Economic Development in Nigeria since 1960. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(6): 1-7
- Anifowose, R. (1982). *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. Enugu: Nok Publishers. [Second Edition 2005].
- Chedotum, K., Cheserek, G. J., Kiptui, M. and Arusei, E. J. (2013). Causes and Effects of Post-election Violence on Agricultural Production in Kesses Division, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*. 4(1): 62-70
- Chow, G. C. (1960). Tests of equality between sets of coefficients in two linear regression. *Econometrica*. 26(3), 591-605.
- CITAD (2015). Report of one-day stakeholders' forum on hate speech and the 2015 elections in Nigeria", Retrieved from <http://www.citad.org-report-of-one-day-stakeholders-forum-onhate-speech-and-the-2015-elections-in-nigeria> on 10th April 2015.
- Ezeibe C. C. (2013) "Hate speech and post electoral violence in Africa", *African Renaissance* 10 (2 & 4): 75-87.
- Fischer, J. (2002). Electoral Conflict and Violence: A strategy for study and prevention. *IFES White Papers*.
- Ghilagaber, G. (2004). Another look at Chow's test for the equality of two heteroscedastic regression models. *Quality and Quantity*, 38:81-93, Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands.
- Igbuzor, O. (2010). Electoral Violence in Nigeria. Asaba: Action Aid Nigeria.
- International Crisis Group, (2009). Nigeria: Seizing the moment in the Niger Delta. Africa policy briefing, Abuja/Dakar/Brussels.
- Mustapha, S. B., Makinta, A. A., Zongoma, B. A. and Iwan, A. S. (2012). The Socio-economic Factors Affecting Adoption of Soya Bean Production Technology in Takum Local Government Area of Taraba State Nigeria:*Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 2(2): 276-281
- Patricia, E. O. (2011). Provocative Discourse and Violence in Nigeria's 2011 Elections: *AfricaPortal Backgrounder* No. 17
- Thompson, B. U. (2010). Electoral Violence in Nigeria: Implications for Security, Peace and Development. *Peace and Conflict Monitor* 3rd of May, 2010
http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id_article=697 Assessed on the fifth march, 2012.
- Tukur, M. (2011). News Analysis: Post-Election Crisis In Kaduna State. Kaduna Chronicle online, 2nd May.
http://www.kadunachronicle.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=51:majority-of-americans-lack-faith&catid=25:frontpage-news. Accessed on 5th Feb. 2012.
- Zaur, I. (2006).*Agriculture and Conflict: a conceptual framework for development*. Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy Thesis, The Fletcher School, tufts, University

Intra-Household Bargaining, Gender Consideration in Decision Making and Food Security Status of Farm Households in Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria

¹Adekunle, C. P., ²Aromolaran, A. K., ¹Oladeji, S.O., ³Oluwatusin, F.M.

¹Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management,
Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.

²Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,
Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.

³Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension,
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

Corresponding Email: chiomaadekunle@gmail.com

Abstract:

Women contribute significantly to food production in Nigeria, however, several research findings confirmed that they are often marginalized in the decision making process. This study examines intra-household bargaining, gender consideration in decision making process and food security among farming households in Abeokuta, Ogun state. A multistage sampling procedure was used to select 240 farming households; with husbands and wives interviewed separately. The study examines the wife's bargaining power over 13 households and farming decisions. Data analysis was done using descriptive statistics, Decision Making Index, and logit regression model. The result of the findings shows that the level of decision-making authority among wives varies significantly across households. The majority (57.5%) of the households were food insecure. Also, most of the men (84.2%) control the income from the sales of agricultural products and off-farm activities while the women (76.8%) took more decision regarding consumption and children's education. Besides, 63.33% of women have low bargaining power, while 26.25% have moderate bargaining power and 10.42% of the women have high bargaining power. The regression result shows that years of education of women ($p < 0.001$), household size ($p < 0.01$), access to credit ($p < 0.001$), main occupation of the household head ($p < 0.001$), membership of farmers' association of the household head ($p < 0.001$), age of household head ($p < 0.001$), age differential between spouse ($p < 0.005$), household income of household head ($p < 0.001$), proportion of women's income in household total income ($p < 0.005$), women bargaining power ($p < 0.005$) were significant factors influencing the food security status of the farming household in the study area. The study shows that there is a household gender-based decision which influences household food security. Households in which women did not participate in decisions making on income and food management were more vulnerable to household food insecurity because men were not concerned about household food requirements. The study affirms the roles of intra-household decision making on household food security. Therefore, gender-based resource allocation and women empowerment policies should be encouraged to ensure that households are food secure.

Keywords: decision making, farm households, food security, gender, income, resource allocation,

Introduction

Household decision making and resource allocation are critical to economic and human development. The decisions made at household levels influence the welfare of the household and the communities. Such decisions include where to live, how to generate income, invest and consume, and how many children to have (Kim *et al.*, 2017). The outcomes of such decisions influence economic performance at the household and national level. The dynamics of

intra-household decision making and resource allocation may have significant impact on the welfare of farm households in a poor economic environment.

Within households, many factors influence the dynamics of intra-household decision making. Such includes age, marital status, culture, income level, and education. If the male household members have different preferences, it is expected that households will

behave differently according to who controls household resources. For example, it is often argued that when women have better command over income, decisions on the use of resources tend to favour children more in terms of human capital investment (Hoddinott and Haddad 1995; Bourguignon and Chiappori 1992; Browning and Chiappori 1998; Bussolo, De Hoyos, and Wodon 2009). Lloyd and Blanc (1996) and Blackden and Bhanu (1999) argued that children in female-headed households in Sub-Saharan Africa have better enrollment rates than those in male-headed households. Higher involvement of women in decision making within the household has also been shown to lead to better outcomes in terms of nutrition (Piesse and Simister 2002). Household decision-making models assume family as a homogenous unit operating with a typical utility function (Becker, 1962), whose members share the same amount of access to and utilization of household's resources, including food. However, these models are not capable of explaining dynamics impacting intra-household resource allocation and its effects on distribution within the family.

There is a vast number of empirical and theoretical studies declining altruistic family joint utility function theory of Becker (1962). However, Sen (2013) theory of intra-household bargaining shows the inequality in the decision-making process among different members of households and how this inequality affects the distribution of resources.

Gender inequality both leads to and is a result of food insecurity. According to estimates, women and girls make up 60% of the world's chronically hungry and little progress has been made in ensuring the equal right to food for women enshrined in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (World Food Programme, 2009; Spieldoch, 2011). Women face discrimination both in education and employment opportunities and within the household, where their bargaining power is low. On the other hand, gender equality is instrumental to ending malnutrition and hunger (FAO, ADB 2013). Women tend to be responsible for food preparation and childcare within the family and are more likely to spend their income on food and their children's needs. The gendered aspects of food security are visible

along the four pillars of food security: availability, access, utilization and stability, as defined by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2006).

Food availability is defined at the World Food Summit as having sufficient quantities of foods available consistently (FAO, 1996). The critical roles women play in food production, processing, distribution and marketing cannot be overemphasized. They often work as an unpaid family worker and are involved in subsistence farming and represent about 43% of the agricultural labour force in developing countries, varying from 20% in Latin America to 50% in Eastern and Southeastern Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa (FAO, 2011). Despite these, women face discrimination in access to land, credit, technologies, finance and other services. Studies suggest that if women had the same access to productive resources as men, women could boost their yields by 20–30%; raising the overall agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5 to 4.0% (FAO, 2011).

Women's access to food is closely connected to households' food access because they are typically responsible for food supply in households (The World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, International Fund for Agricultural Development, 2008). Women can access food by producing it for their consumption or purchasing it with income. Income is either generated from market activity or by redistributive mechanisms through the government's social protection measure or community's solidarity (FAO, ADB 2013).

A study conducted by Haddad and Hoddinott, (1994) in Côte d'Ivoire found that for men, it needs eleven times bigger income of women to improve children's nutrition to the same level at which women achieve. Kennedy and Peters (1992), demonstrated that poorer female-headed households often succeed in providing more nutritious food for their children than poorer male-headed households. Geheb, Kalloh, Medard, Nyapendi, Lweya and Kyangwa, (2008) posited that people living near Lake Victoria, women typically considered their children as the first or second most significant expenditure, while men did not view them as a