

**ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AMONG
RURAL FARMERS IN OSUN STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

ADEDIJI, GANIYU ADEBOWALE
B.Sc. (Macomb, Illinois) M.Sc. (Ibadan).

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE (Ph.D) IN
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RURAL SOCIOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT,
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE, OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY,
ILE-IFE, NIGERIA**

2015

AUTHORIZATION TO COPY

OBAFEMI AWOLowo UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE

HEZEKIAH OLUWASANMI LIBRARY

POSTGRADUATE THESIS

AUTHOR: **ADEDIJI, GANIYU ADEBOWALE**

TITLE: ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RISK MANAGEMENT
PRACTICES AMONG RURAL FARMERS IN OSUN STATE,
NIGERIA

DEGREE: Ph.D. (AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RURAL SOCIOLOGY)

YEAR: 2015

I, ADEDIJI, GANIYU ADEBOWALE hereby authorize the Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library to copy my thesis in whole or in part, in response to requests from individual researchers or organizations for the purpose of private studies or research.

Date.....

Signature.....

CERTIFICATION

This research project written by ADEDIJI, Adebowale Ganiyu has been read, approved and adjudged to meet part of the requirements for the award of Ph.D Degree in Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria.

.....
Prof. A. J. Farinde
Supervisor

.....
Dr. (Mrs.) O. F. Deji
Chief Examiner

OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to God and Humanity.

OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give all glory, praises and honour to God for making this academic pursuit a possibility. I thank God for the wisdom, knowledge and understanding granted unto me throughout the period of the study.

I immensely appreciate the role of my supervisor, Prof. A. J. Farinde in my academic pursuit, even well before this stage of my academic endeavour. I am grateful for his interest in my work, support especially in terms of advice, necessary guidance, painstakingly reading the write up and making necessary corrections. My special thank goes to Dr. (Mrs.) O. F. Deji, Head of the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development for her support and willingness in providing all the academic and administrative supports.

My special appreciation goes to Prof. A. A. Jibowo and Prof. E. A. Laogun for their fatherly assistance and immense contributions to the success in my academic pursuit. The contributions, encouragement and concern of Dr. A. O Ajayi and Dr. S. A. Adesoji are significantly important to the success of this work. I sincerely appreciate their availability at every point of need and for sharing their precious time and experience to give this work the desired shape.

I am grateful to other academic members of staff, namely- Prof. D. O. Torimiro, Dr. F. O. Adereti, Dr. A. F. Agboola, Dr. B. O. Adisa, Dr. K. O. Soyebó, Dr. (Mrs.) H. F. B. Faborode, Dr. T. F. Ojo, Dr. J. O. Ayinde and Dr. V. O. Okorie for their various contributions to the success of this work. All non-academic staff of the Department deserve my appreciation for the necessary assistance freely offered throughout my period of study.

I also received the helpful support and encouragement of Prof. I. O. Oladosu, Prof. .A. B Ogunwale, Prof. (Mrs). E. O. Okunade all of Ladoke Akintola University of Technology,

Ogbomoso. Only those who know them and know me will understand my debts to Prof. A.B. Ayanwale, Prof. E. O. Idowu, Prof. T. Alimi, and Dr. I. O. Baruwa of the Department of Agricultural Economics. I am also grateful to all the staff of the Osun State Office of Nigerian Agricultural Insurance Corporation under the leadership of Mr. O. A. Adelowo for their cooperation in making available the needed agricultural insurance information to me.

I also acknowledge and appreciate the efforts, support and encouragement of all my colleagues in the Osun State Fadama Coordination Office especially Dr. A. A. Olaniyi, Mr. O. A. Kafi, Mr. O. A. Oyekanmi and all other management staff, and the support staff especially my secretaries Mrs. Iyabo Folorunso and Mrs. Waliyat Gbadegesin. All the rural farmers interviewed freely gave their time to attend to me and other enumerators. I wish to remember here, their special kindness, patience and understanding.

A large measure of credit must be assigned to my wife Titilola and children- Yetunde, Mayowa, Dewumi and Dotun, who contributed their patience, enthusiasm, understanding and encouragement while I poured and burned the mid-night oil. Thank you all.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Title page	i
Authorization to copy.....	ii
Certification.....	iii
Dedication.....	i
v	
Acknowledgements	v-vi
Table of content.....	vii-
xii	
List of tables.....	xiii-
xiv	
List of figures.....	xv
Abstract.....	xvi-xvii
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of research problem	5
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	
8	
1.4 Hypotheses of the study.....	8
1.5 Significance of the study.....	10



1.6	Assumptions of the study.....	11
1.7	Operational definition of terms.....	11

CHAPTER TWO

	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	14
2.1	Concept of risk.....	14
2.2	Types of risks	18
2.3	Management of risks.....	27
2.4	Agricultural risk	42
2.5	Risk perception.....	53
2.5.1	Values and “non-rational” factors in risk perception.....	55
2.5.2	Differences between expert and lay person perceptions.....	57
2.5.3	Farmers risk perceptions	60
2.5.4	Farmers and risk innovations	63
2.5.5	Farmers’ perceptions of risk management practices.....	66
2.6	Risk attitude.....	67
2.7	Risk communication	69
2.8	Vulnerability to agricultural risks	76
2.8.1	Concept of vulnerability	76
2.9	Theoretical framework.....	81
2.10	Operationalization of the proposed conceptual model.....	86

CHAPTER THREE

	METHODOLOGY.....	88
3.1	The study area	88

3.2	Sample size and selection.....	91
3.3	Research instrument and data collection.....	92
3.3.1	Validation of the research instruments.....	92
3.3.2	Reliability test.....	92
3.3.3	Data collection.....	93
3.3.4	Analysis of data.....	93
3.4	Definition and measurement of variables.....	93
3.4.1	Independent variables.....	93
3.4.2	Dependent variable.....	97
3.5	Justification for the use of statistical techniques	97
CHAPTER FOUR		
RESULTS AND		
DISCUSSION.....101		
4.1	Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of respondents.....	101
4.1.1		
	Age.....	10
1		
4.1.2		
	Sex.....	10
2		
4.1.3	Marital	
	status.....	102
4.1.4	Household size.....	103

4.1.5		
	Religion.....	10
3		
4.1.6	Number of years of formal education.....	103
4.1.7	Level of education.....	104
4.1.8	Mode of farmland acquisition.....	106
4.1.9	Major occupation.....	107
4.1.10	Types of farming.....	108
4.1.11	Farm size.....	111
4.1.12	Other size of land uncultivated.....	111
4.1.13	Reasons for the non-cultivation of farmland.....	113
4.1.14	Secondary occupation.....	115
4.1.15	On-farm income.....	115
4.1.16	Number of animal reared.....	116
4.1.17	Sources of labour.....	119
4.1.18	Type of agricultural inputs used.....	119
4.1.19	Sources of inputs.....	120
4.1.20	Sources of credits.....	120
4.1.21	Membership of social organisation.....	121
4.1.22	External orientation.....	121
4.1.23	Contact with extension agents and nature of training received.....	123
4.2	Types and sources of risks associated with farming.....	125
4.2.1	Production/Yield risks.....	125

4.2.2	Marketing/price risks.....	125
4.2.3	Financial risks.....	126
4.2.4	Human/personal risks.....	127
4.4.5	Legal/institutional risks.....	130
4.2.6	Sources of information on risks types.....	132
4.3	Knowledge and perception of agricultural risks.....	134
4.3.1	Knowledge of agricultural production/yield risks.....	134
4.3.2	Knowledge of marketing/price risks.....	135
4.3.3	Knowledge of financial risks.....	135
4.3.4	Knowledge of human/personal risks.....	136
4.3.5	Knowledge of legal risks.....	137
4.3.6	Farmers' perception of agricultural risks.....	140
4.4	Vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	143
4.4.1	Shock in income, assets and consumption.....	143
4.4.2	Degree of vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	145
4.4.3	Relationship between farmers' perception of agricultural risks and vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	149
4.4.4	Degree of vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	151
4.5	Risk management practices among farmers	153
4.5.1	Production risk control.....	153
4.5.2	Financial risk control practices.....	155
4.5.3	Health and safety risk management practices.....	157
4.5.4	Religious/ cultural beliefs practices.....	159
4.5.5	Agricultural risks reduction practices.....	161



4.5.6	Risk sharing and transfer.....	163	
4.5.6.1	Respondents awareness of agricultural insurance scheme.....	165	
4.5.6.2	Respondents perception of agricultural insurance scheme.....	167	
4.5.7	Risk accommodation.....	169	
4.5.8	Risk prediction.....	171	
4.6	Results of hypotheses testing.....	173	
4.6.1	Results of Chi-square analysis showing the association between demographic and socio-economic characteristics of farmers and agricultural risk management practices H_{01}	173	
4.6.1.1	Results of Pearson Correlation showing relationship between socio-economic characteristics of farmers and agricultural risk management practices.....	176	
4.6.2	Relationship between farmers' perception of agricultural risks and risk management practices	178	
4.6.3	Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing differences in the management of agricultural risks across the three agricultural zones of the study area.....	180	
4.7	Factors influencing risk management practices of farmers.....	183	
4.7.1	Principal component analysis of factors associated risk management practices.....	183	
CHAPTER FIVE			
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND			
RECOMMENDATIONS.....			195
5.0	Summary.....	19	
5.1	Statement of research problem investigated.....	195	
5.2	Objective of the study.....	195	



5.3	Hypothesis of the study.....	196
5.4	Contributions to knowledge.....	196
5.5	Methodology of the study.....	197
5.6	Summary of findings.....	197
5.6.1	Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of respondents.....	197
5.6.2	Types and sources of risks associated with farming.....	198
5.6.2.1	Knowledge and perception of agricultural risks.....	200
5.6.2.2	Farmers' perception of agricultural risks.....	200
5.7.	Vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	200
5.7.1	Degree of vulnerability to agricultural risks.....	201
5.7.2	Risk management practices among farmers.....	201
5.7.3	Hypotheses testing.....	202
5.8	Conclusion.....	202
5.9	Recommendations.....	204
5.10	Suggestions for further studies.....	205
	REFERENCES	206-222
	APPENDIX I	223-
		235
	APPENDIX II	
		236



LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. 2012 and Q1 – Q3 2013 Real Gross Domestic Product (Constant 1990): Sectoral Contribution (Percentages)	4
2 Risk Dimensions.....	36
3. Extension Blocks, Communities and proposed number of farmers sampled in each agricultural zone.....	91
4. Distribution of respondents by their demographic characteristics.....	105
5. Distribution of respondents by their demographic characteristics (Cont'd).....	110
6. Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic characteristics	118
7. Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic characteristics.....	122
8. Distribution of respondents based on their awareness of types of risks and their exposure to the identified risks.....	129
9. Distribution of respondents based on their sources of information on Agricultural risks.....	133
10. Distribution of respondents based on their knowledge of agricultural risks.....	138
11. Distribution of respondents based on their perception of identified risks associated Farming.....	142
12. Respondents degree of vulnerability to causes of agricultural risks.....	147
13. Correlation matrix of vulnerability variables to agricultural risk.....	150
14. Results of marginal analysis of ordered probit regression.....	152
15. Distribution of respondents based on their risk management practices used.....	154
16. Distribution of respondents based on their financial risk management practices.....	156

17.	Distribution of respondents based on their health and safety risk Management practices.....	158
18.	Distribution of respondents based on their religious risks management practices.....	160
19.	Distribution of respondents based on their general methods of risk reduction.....	162
20.	Distribution of respondents based on their practices of risk sharing and transfer.....	164
21.	Respdents awareness of agricultural insurance scheme.....	166
22.	Perception of agricultural insurance scheme.....	168
23.	Distribution of respondents based on their risk accommodationpractices.....	170
24.	Distribution of respondents based on their risk predictionpractices.....	172
25.	Results of Chi-square showing the association between selected personal and socio-economic characteristics of farmers and agricultural risks management practices observed.....	175
26.	Results of Pearson Correlation showing relationship between farmers' socio-economic characteristics and agricultural risks managementpractices.....	177
27.	Results of Pearson Correlation showing relationship between farmers' attitude and agricultural risks management practices.....	179
28.	Results of Analysis of Variance showing significant difference in the agricultural risk management practices across three agro-ecologicalzones.....	181
29.	Results of Post Hoc showing differences in agricultural risks management practices across agro-ecological zones.....	182
30.	Principal component analysis of risk management practices among farmers.....	184
31.	Factor analysis showing variables associated with institutional factor in the management of risk associated withfarming.....	186
32.	Factor analysis showing variables contributing to 'social network' factor influencing risk management practices amongfarmers.....	188
33.	Factor analysis showing variables contributing to 'economic factor' influencing risk management practices of farmers.....	190



34.	Factor analysis showing variables associated with ‘belief system’ influencing risk management practices.....	192
35.	Factor analysis showing variables contributing to ‘personal’ factor influencing risk management practices offarmers.....	194

OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Conceptualframework.....	87
2. Map of Osun State showing studyarea.....	90
3. Distribution of farmers based on their mode of farmland acquisition	107
4. Distribution of respondents by their farmsize.....	112
5. Reasons for the non-cultivation of otherland.....	114
6. Mean number of contacts with extension agents and the number of training had within the last 6months.....	124
7. Distrubtion of respondents based on their awareness and their exposure to institutionalrisks.....	131
8. Distribution of respondents based on their level of knowledge of all the different categories of risks.....	139
9. Distribution of respondents by the shock that caused reduction in income, assets and consumption between 2009-2013.....	144
10. Degree of farmers' vulnerability to agricultural risks cross agro-ecological zones.....	148

ABSTRACT

The study specifically identified types and sources of agricultural risks to which farmers are exposed; determined their knowledge and perception of agricultural risks; analyzed current risk management practices adopted and determined the degree of vulnerability of the farmers to agricultural risks with a view to providing information for Agricultural Extension workers to enable them to disseminate appropriate information on agricultural risk.

The study was conducted in Osun State of Nigeria using the three Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) agricultural zones namely Ife/Ijesa, Osogbo and Iwo. Multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 150 rural farmers from Ife/Ijesa zone, 120 from Osogbo zone and 90 from Iwo zone, making a total of 360 respondents sampled for the study. However, only 351 questionnaire and interview schedule administered were properly completed and returned. Data collected were described with mean, standard deviation, frequency counts and percentages while inferential statistics like Chi-square, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Tobit Regression and Factor Analysis were used to make deductions.

The results revealed that surplus produce (glut) (84.6%), low demand for produce (82.3%), high cost of inputs (81.8%), sudden fall in price of goods (78.9%), pest/disease outbreak (77.5%), poor seeds/animal foundation stocks (76.4%), insufficient funding (76.1%), unfavourable weather condition (drought/heavy rainfall) (75.5%) and floods (73.5%) were the common types of risks identified by the farmers. About 78.5 percent had high knowledge of production risks, 89.6 percent of marketing risks, 58.8 percent of the respondents had high knowledge of financial risks. Slightly above average (53.7%) of the respondents had high knowledge of human/personal risks while 93.1 percent had low level of knowledge in legal risks. The results further show that most of the respondents moderately perceived all the identified

farm risks in the study area. The findings revealed that slightly above average (55.3%) of the farmers had a very low level of awareness of agricultural insurance scheme and low degree of vulnerability to all the identified farm risks. The findings revealed that marital status ($\chi^2 = 869.82$), major occupation ($\chi^2 = 119.31$), gender ($\chi^2 = 119.70$), religion ($\chi^2 = 327.70$) and types of farming ($\chi^2 = 224.73$) had significant association with farmers' risks management practices at both 5% and 1% significant levels. Also, age ($r = 0.358$), farm size ($r = 0.271$) and years of formal education ($r = 0.107$) were the correlates of agricultural risk management practices among farmers. It was revealed that there was no significant difference in the risk management practices associated with farming across the three agricultural zones of the study area.

In conclusion, rural farmers were quite aware of most of the risks associated with farming, their level of risk knowledge was also high and their risk perception was moderate. These enable the farmers to adopt some perceived effective agricultural risk management practices.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.3 Background to the Study

Agriculture remains a sizeable part of most developing countries' economies as it employs about two thirds of the labour force and accounts for 37 per cent of Gross National Product (GNP) and one half of exports in Africa (Department for International Development (DFID), 2012). It remains a significant source of wealth and an important influence on poverty reduction and overall economic performance. The theme for the year 2000 World Food Day, "A millennium free from hunger", underscored the importance attached to problems of hunger by the world body-Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations Organization (UNO). Projections by experts on the world food situation and population in the last two decades, point to food shortages and widespread famine, especially in the poor countries. Bender and Smith (1999) observed that in spite of the extra ordinary growth in agricultural production in the last few decades, which resulted in increased per capita food supply despite the unprecedented population growth; there are warning signs that we may be reaching the limits of agricultural expansion. Bender and Smith (1999) further remarked that widespread problems of water and wind erosion, desertification, salinization, unpredictable rainfall pattern and increased pests and diseases attacks suggest that the amount of land available and suitable for agricultural production may be fast shrinking to a point that the current production level and pattern may not be sustainable.

In the sub-Saharan Africa where Nigeria features prominently, the population projection is put at 1.12 billion by the year 2020 and 1.79 billion by the year 2050 United Nations Organization (UNO), 1996). Currently, about 43 per cent of the population in sub-Saharan

Africa is malnourished and reports from different countries showed that an average of 65 per cent of the people lives below poverty line. In Nigeria, about 60 percent of the population lives below the poverty line. The presentation above on the trend of food production and poverty situation shows that something urgent needs to be done to rectify the anomalies.

The World Bank (2000) proposed a framework for tackling poverty, which involves coordinated efforts in three areas namely:

- (i) Increasing economic opportunity by opening up more job opportunities through diversification, processing, and value addition to products.
- (ii) Increasing voice and empowerment by creating more level plain grounds for training and capacity building to enable more people to participate in decision making about what affect them.
- (iii) Tackling vulnerability in this context means preventing and managing economy-wide shocks, and providing mechanisms to reduce the sources of vulnerability that poor people face. This enables more effective participation in growth process, which is likely to remain agricultural -based for the majority of the rural poor in Nigeria.

Agriculture remains the most important poverty – reduction sector of the Nigerian economy. In the 1960s it provided employment for about 80 percent of the adult working population and earned about 60 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Olayide, 1976). However, recently agricultural output accounted for only 42 percent of the GDP in 2012 as shown in Table1. (Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), 2013 and Nationa Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2013)

Agriculture is believed by many to hold great economic potentials for the nation but the right approach and the correct road map to this destination has remained difficult to fully conceptualize in policy terms.

Successive governments have made concerted efforts to address this ugly trend through some intervention programmes. According to Jibowo (2004), some of the agricultural programmes launched and executed by government included; National Accelerated Food Production Programme in 1973; River Basin Development Authority in 1975; Operation Feed the Nation launched in 1976; Green Revolution in 1980; Agricultural Development Programme conceived in 1972 but launched in 1975; National Special Programme for Food Security launched in 2003; and the National Fadama Development Project 1992; 2004; 2009 and 2014. Limited success were achieved from the programmes.

As a primary production sector, agriculture itself has to be modernized in order to achieve the much-needed increase in the productivity of the sector. This modernization has brought with it, some man-made risks in addition to the naturally available risks that are associated with agricultural activities in Nigeria.

For an individual farmer, according to Pennsylvania State Cooperative Extension Service (2005) risk management involves finding the preferred combination of activities with uncertain outcomes and varying levels of expected return. One might say that risk management involves choosing among alternatives for reducing the effects of risk on a farm, and in so doing affect the farm's welfare position. Some risk management strategies (such as diversification) reduce risk within the farm's operation, others (such as production contracting) transfer risk outside the farm, and still others (such as maintaining liquid assets) build the farm's capacity to bear risk.

Risk management typically requires the evaluation of tradeoffs between changes in risk, expected returns, entrepreneurial freedom and other variables.

For more information, please contact ir-help@oauife.edu.ng

OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY