

NIGERIAN AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL ISSN: 0300-368X Volume 53 Number 1, April 2022 Pg. 223-228 Available online at: http://www.ajol.info/index.php/naj https://www.naj.asn.org.ng 0_____

Creative Commons User License CC:BY

Differentials in Farming activities and Determinants of Credit Use among Women Farmers in **Obio/Akpor and Emohua LGAs, Rivers State, Nigeria**

Obe-Nwaka, M.O., Okidim, I.A. and Worlu, A.A.

Department of Agricultural & Applied Economics, Rivers state University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State Corresponding Author's email: obe4oloi@gmail.com

Abstract

The study examined the determinants of farm credit access (use) among women farmers in Obio/aAkpor and Emohua Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria. Data were collected using a semi-structured questionnaire, and total of two hundred and thirty-three (233) questionnaires administered. One hundred and sixty-one (161) were selected from seven communities in Emohua and seventy two (72) from four communities in Obio/Akpor. Data were analyzed with the use of percentage, mean scores and logit regression. Findings showed that many (42.2% in Emohua and 37.5% in Obio/Akpor) were between 31-40 years, married (40.4%, 66.7%), had primary education (51.6%, 65.3%), household size of 1-4 persons (48.4%, 58.3%) have been in farming between 16 - 20 years (34.2%, 43.1%) in that order. Majority (59.6%) in Emohua and (66.7%) in Obio/Akpor were involved in crop farming alone. The result of the logit regression analysis showed that age, marital status, educational level, occupation and type of farming activity were significant determinants of credit accessibility in the two LGAs at P<0.05. The study recommends that to increase credit access, there should be flexibility in the types of collateral required by financial institutions.

Keywords: Determinants, women-farmers, Farm-credit

Introduction

Agriculture's contribution to the Nigerian economy is critical and divergent, providing food for the increasing population, raw materials, jobs, foreign exchange earnings, and demand for goods from the industrial sector (Eze et al., 2010). In developing countries like Nigeria, it has always been instrumental in socioeconomic growth. Onwualu (2012) noted that agriculture stands out as the dominant sector in remote areas of Nigeria, where about 70% of the Nigerian population habits. The agrarian societies of Emohua and Obio-Akpor are strongly dominated by women who are actively engaged in agricultural activities. Women are passionate about their farming activities in Obio-Akpor and Emuoha (Obe-Nwaka et al., 2020). One thing remains clear; women have been known as the powerhouse of subsistence farming in Nigeria as they account for about 80% of food consumed (Iruonagbe, 2009; Sahel, 2014). Women make essential contributions to the agricultural and rural economies in all developing countries (FAO, 2011). Most are poor, lack modern education, and have little or no organizational skills (UN, 1992). DAW and UNIFEM (2001) noted that rural women have the lowest income level and are the most marginalized parties of the global village. In Nigeria and other developing countries,

access to credit among women has been adversely affected by socio-economic and structural factors. Male heads of households have been the intended targets of most rural financial programmes that have been massively structured, planned and implemented to help them, failing to realize that women, with their own financial needs and constraints, are active, efficient and engaged economic agents (Obe-Nwaka et al., 2020). The constraint militating against women in accessing productive resources is becoming more serious. Rural women who make up the majority of the agricultural population in Rivers State are poor, the only alternative to raising money has continued to elude them. They have been made to produce at the subsistence level with insufficient finance. These problems need to be addressed hence the study. It is based on this that the study sought to achieve the following specific objectives: identify the socio-economic characteristics of women 'farmers' in the study areas; examine the type(s) of agricultural activities engaged in by women in the study areas; and; examine the determinants of women's access to credit in Emohua and Obio/Akpor Local Government Areas.

Methodology

This research was performed in Obio/Akpor and Emohua Local Government Areas (LGAs), Rivers State, Nigeria. In the North, Obio/Akpor LGA is bordered by Etche LGA in the South by Port-Harcourt City LGA; Ikwerre LGA and Emuoha LGA on the East; and Oyigbo LGA and Eleme LGA on the West. On the other hand, Emouha is the headquarters of Emohua LGA in the State. It is bounded on the North by Ahoada East and West LGAs and Abua/Odual LGA, on the South by Obio/Akpor LGA, East by Ikwerre LGA, and West by Asari Toru and Degema LGAs. Although on a subsistent scale, the predominant occupation of the Ikwerre ethnicity is farming, they also engage in secondary activities like fishing, hunting, smelting, and trading (Obe-Nwaka et al., 2020). Farming, trading, and artisanship are the mainstream occupations of the people. For this study, a multi-stage random sampling method was used. Firstly, two LGAs (Obio/Akpor and Emohua) were purposively selected based on dominnce in the number of women farmers; with Emohua representing a typical rural agrarian setting, while Obio/Akpor a semi-urban area. Secondly, purposive sampling selected eleven (11) communities out of the two LGAs. In Emohua LGA, seven (7) communities were chosen, and four (4) communities in Obio/Akpor LGA. Finally, random sampling was used to select one hundred and sixty one (161) women farmers in Emohua and seventy-two (72) in Obio-Akpor, giving a total sample size of two hundred and thirty-three (233) respondents. The data collected from respondents were examined using descriptive (such as mean score, percentage) and inferential (logistic model regression) statistics to accomplish the study objectives. A logistic regression model was used to analyze determinants of access to credit by female farmers as presented by Eze et al. (2009). The model employed in the analysis is f o 1 1 o w s : specified a s

$$LnY = Ln \left(\frac{Pi}{1-Pi}\right)$$

= $\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + e$

Where;

Y = Access and non-access to credit for the two LGAs (dummy variable, access to credit = 1 and 0 = nonaccess to credit) Pi = probability of access to credit 1-Pi = probability of non-access to credit Ln = natural logarithm function X_i = independent variables (where *i* goes from 1-8) $X_1 = Age of the female farmers (years)$ $X_2 = Marital status (married = 1, otherwise = 0)$ $X_3 =$ Household size (persons) $X_4 =$ occupational status (farm=1, non-farm=0) X_5 = Level of education (No formal education = 1, Formal education = 2 to 4) X_6 = Years of experience in farming (years) $X_7 =$ Type of farming activity (crop=1, livestock and crop and fishing=0) $X_s = monthly income (naira)$

 $\beta_0 = \text{Constant}$

 $\beta =$ Regression coefficients

e = Stochastic error term

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

The age of farmers is categorized by Harun (2014) into three namely; young (15-30 years), middle (31-50) and aged (>50 years). From the result in Table 1, it was shown that 9.9% of the respondents in Emohua were within the young age, 66.4% middle age and 23.6% old, whereas, in Obio/Akpor, 20.8% fell within the young age, 65.3% middle age and 13.9% old age category. On average, 13.3% were within the young age, 66.1% middle age and 20.6% old in the two LGAs. Considering the large percentage of farmers in the middle category in the two LGAs, it could be deduced that the areas have a lot of available human resources. If this human resource is adequately exploited, the areas in the entire state will become the wealthiest. This finding is consistent with that of Eghosa (2015) in his research on the Role of Women in Agricultural Production in Ovia Southwest LGA of Edo State, in which the majority (41.2%) of the respondents were within the middle age category. The distribution of the respondents according to their marital status showed that in Emohua, 40.4% of respondents were married, 26.7% widowed, 15.5% Divorced/Separated, and 15.5% single, whereas, in Obio/Akpor, 66.7% were married, 16.9% widowed, 9.7% single, and 6.9% divorced/separated. This result aligns with Eghosa (2015), which showed that most of the respondents were married. Educational level in Emohua LGA showed that majority (51.6%) had primary education, while 29.7% had secondary education. Among the 161 women interviewed, only 16 (9.9%) completed tertiary education. Of the total respondents, about 8.7% had no formal schooling. In summary, about 91.3% of the women in Emohua LGA had formal education. In Obio/Akpor LGA, about 11.1% of the women had no formal education, and 65.3% had primary education. About 13.9% and 9.7% attended secondary and tertiary schools, respectively. To sum up, 88.9% of women had formal schooling in Obio/Akpor LGA. This finding is in line with Nyamba and Mlozi (2012), who found that most farmers were educated in the area of study. The findings on household size showed that many (48.4%) respondents in Emohua and 58.3% in Obio/Akpor had a household size of 5 to 8 persons. Some of the respondents (27.3%) in Emohua and 25.0% in Obio/Akpor had a household size of 1 to 4 persons. Few of the respondents (24.2%) in Emohua and 16.7% in Obio/Akpor had a household size of 9 to 12. The mean household size in Emohua, Obio/Akpor, and aggregate of the two LGAs were 6 persons. The average size of six households is in line with the nationally prescribed size of six households (Eze et al., 2009). In addition, Table 1 indicates that the primary occupation of most of the respondents from the two LGAs was farming. In ranking the occupations, the two LGAs identified farming as the most important occupation represented by 52.8% in Emohua, 58.3% in Obio/Akpor, and 54.5% for the two LGAs. Emohua LGA indicated trading (28.6%) as another important

occupation and employment in the civil service as less important (18.6%), while Obio/Akpor LGA indicated employment in the civil service (33.3%) as an important occupation and trading (8.3%) as less important. This finding is in line with the findings of Samson and Obademi (2018), who stated that farming was defined as their main occupation by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. The beneficiaries indicated civil service as another important occupation and trading as less important, while the non-beneficiaries regarded trading as another important occupation and civil service as less important. The years of experience of respondents in farming practice indicate that 34.2% of respondents in Emohua LGA have been farmers for approximately 16 to 20 years. Here, 21.7% have been in farming for about 11 - 15 years, 19.9% for about 6 - 10 year and 17.4% 21 years and above. Only 6.8% have been farmers for about 1 - 5 years in Emohua LGA. In Obio/Akpor LGA, many (43.1%) of the respondents have been farmers for between 16 and 20 years. In descending proportions, 20.8%, 15.3%, 13.9% and 6.9% had farming experience of about 11 to 15 years, 21 years and above, 6 - 10 years and 1 - 5 years respectively. The average farming experience in Emohua was 14 years, 15 years in Obio/Akpor and 15 years for the two LGAs. The consequence is that women farmers in the two LGAs have sufficient farming experience, which has a positive impact on agricultural production. The more seasoned a farmer is, the more he or she will use expended funds judiciously (Oriaku, 2010). About 34.7% of the respondents in Emohua earned between N51,000 -N60,000 monthly from their farm produce. Another 28.6% earned between N41,000 - N50,000, 11.2% between N31,000-N40,000, 9.3% N20,000-N30,000, 6.8% N71,000 - N80,000 and 6.2% N61,000 -N70,000, while 3.1% indicated that they earn between N81,000 - N90,000. The result further showed that in Obio/Akpor, 36.1% of respondents earned between N41,000 – N50,000 monthly from sale of farm produce, followed by 19.4% who earned between N51,000 -N60,000, 16.1% N31,000 - N40,000, 9.7% N20,000 -N30,000, 6.9% N61,000 - N70,000, 5.6% N71,000 -N80,000 and 4.2% N81,000 - N90,000, while only 1.4% earned between N91,000 – N100,000. The mean monthly income in Emohua was N605,808, whereas the annual income in Obio/Akpor was N590,412. This result implies that farmers in Emohua earned monthly income of N50,484, while farmers in Obio-Akpor earned a monthly income of N49,201. The mean monthly income is greater than the minimum wage of N18,000; this implies that women farmers in the two LGAs earned high monthly income from sales of their produce and therefore is a good source of income to women who are help mates to their husbands. The result of this study is consistent with the study of Okidim and Obe-Nwaka (2021), who found that fish farmers earned a monthly income of N80,417 from sale of their agricultural produce (fish).

Types of Agricultural Activity Involved by women in the two LGAs

Table 2 shows the kinds of agricultural practices that women were involved in the study area. Among the female farmers sampled in Emohua, majority (53.4%) indicated that they were only involved in crop farming, 23.6% in crop and livestock farming, another 23.0% were engaged in fish farming in addition to crop farming. In Obio/Akpor, the study showed that majority (66.7%) of the farmers were only involved in crop farming, 19.4% in crop farming and livestock production, another 13.9% in fish farming alongside crop farming. This study collaborates with Eghosa (2015), who found that 42.9% of respondents claimed that they were only interested in crop farming alone. What Sigler, J. (2017) found in their analysis is hard to debate: plant-based agriculture generates around 1.5 trillion more pounds of "product" than animal agriculture. And it does so more efficiently. This is because plant-based agriculture uses 115 million acres less land. While animal agriculture generates about \$35 billion more than plant agriculture, the expenses generated by animal agriculture are considerably higher-about \$55.8 billion more than in plant farming. Based on these numbers, the report concludes that "plant-based agriculture grows 512% more pounds of food than animal-based agriculture on 69% of the mass of land that animal-based agriculture uses."

Determinants of Access to Credit in the two LGAs

Table 3 showed aggregate logit regression estimates of factors influencing access to credit among the women farmers in the study area. The results show that out of the eight variables, only two were significant for credit access among farmers. These factors are marital status and type of farming. The coefficient of marital status (0.447) was positive and significant at a 5.0% level. This result implies that single farmers in the study area acquired less farm credit than married farmers. Married farmers are perceived to be more responsible and credit worthy, which serves as a drive in the area to obtain farm credit. Financial institutions and lenders also saw married farmers as being relatively more secure, responsible, and capable of repaying borrowed funds. The results of this study are consistent with John and Charles (2015) who contradict Wivine (2012), whose findings indicated that marital status was not a significant factor affecting access to credit among smallholder farmers in their study area. The coefficient of type of farming activity (2.504) was positive and significant at 5% level. This implies that the probability of accessing farm credit is determined by the farmer's type of farming activity. This may be because some farming activities are more profitable, mature early, and already have potential buyers, especially crop produce, enabling the farmer to pay back the loan expended.

Conclusion

The role of farm credit in the development of the agricultural sector cannot be overemphasized. Credit enhances 'farmers' purchasing purchasing power to enable them acquire modern technologies for their farm

production. The study's outcome showed that the aggregate determinant of credit accessibility in the two LGAs was marital status and type of farming activity. In line with the findings of this study, it was recommended that women farmers should engage in the farming of

crops that have early maturation period to enable them access credit, also, since most of the women had only primary education, there is need for adult education to be encouraged for older rural women.

Variables Freq. % Mean Freq. % Mean Freq. % Mean Age (vers) 21 – 30 16 9.9 15 20.8 31 13.3 31 – 40 68 42.2 27 37.5 95 40.8 41 – 50 39 24.2 20 27.8 59 25.3 51 – 60 30 18.6 9 12.5 39 16.7 61 – 70 8 5.0 1 1.4 9 3.9 Married 65 40.4 48 66.7 113 48.5 Single 25 15.5 7 9.7 32 13.7 Divorced 28 17.4 5 6.9 33 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 85 24.9 Tertiary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Houschold size - -		Emo) hua(n	=161)	Obio /	Akpor(n=72)	Pooled		d
Age (years) $21 - 30$ 16 9.9 15 20.8 31 13.3 21 - 30 68 42.2 27 37.5 95 40.8 41 - 50 39 24.2 20 27.8 59 25.3 51 - 60 30 18.6 9 12.5 39 16.7 61 - 70 8 5.0 1 1.4 9 3.9 Marital status 9 3.9 41 Marital status 9 3.9 41 Marital status 9 3.9 41 Marital status 9 3.3 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 23.6 Educational Level 1 14 8.7 8 11.1 22 9.4 Primary 83 51.6 47 65.3 13.0 55.8 58 58 58 24.9 59 14.9 59 9.9 14	Variables	Freq.	%	Mean	Freq.	%	Mean	Freq.	%	Mean
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Age (years)									
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	21 - 30	16	9.9		15	20.8		31	13.3	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	31 - 40	68	42.2		27	37.5		95	40.8	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41 - 50	39	24.2		20	27.8		59	25.3	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	51 - 60	30	18.6		9	12.5		39	16.7	
Mean 42 39 41 Marrial status Marrial status Narrial status 113 48.5 Single 25 15.5 7 9.7 32 13.7 Divorced 28 17.4 5 6.9 33 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 23.6 Educational 16.7 55 23.6 Primary 83 51.6 47 65.3 130 55.8 Secondary 48 29.8 10 13.9 58 24.9 Tertiary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Household size 1.20 51.5 9.9 Pinary 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation T 5 8.	61 - 70	8	5.0		1	1.4		9	3.9	
Marital status Married 65 40.4 48 66.7 113 48.5 Married 65 15.5 7 9.7 32 13.7 Divorced 28 17.4 5 6.9 33 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 23.6 Educational Evel Primary 83 51.6 47 65.3 130 55.8 526 56.9 9.9 Primary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Household size - - - 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation - - 12 16.7 51 21.9 7 Mean 6 5 8.3 51 21.9 7 54.5 <	Mean			42			39			41
Married 65 40.4 48 66.7 113 48.5 Single 25 15.5 7 9.7 32 13.7 Divorced 28 17.4 5 6.9 33 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 23.6 Educational Level Level V Vidowed 48 29.8 10 13.9 58 24.9 Tertiary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Household size $1-4$ 44 27.3 18 25.0 62 26.6 $5 = 8$ 78 48.4 42 58.3 120 51.5 $9 - 12$ 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation 7 7 52 33.3	Marital status									
Single 25 15.5 7 9.7 32 13.7 Divorced 28 17.4 5 6.9 33 14.2 Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 23.6 Educational Evel 1 16.7 55 23.6 None 14 8.7 8 11.1 22 9.4 Primary 83 51.6 47 65.3 130 55.8 Secondary 48 29.8 10 13.9 58 24.9 Tertiary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Houschold size 1 - 4 42 58.3 120 51.5 9-12 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation 1 12 16.7 31 21.9 Years of Experience 1 1 13.9 42 18.1 11 - 15 35 <	Married	65	40.4		48	66.7		113	48.5	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Single	25	15.5		7	9.7		32	13.7	
Widowed 43 26.7 12 16.7 55 11.1 Educational Level Image: Constraint of the stress o	Divorced	28	17.4		5	69		33	14.2	
Intervel1216.71216.725.725.8None148.7811.1229.4Primary8351.64765.313055.8Secondary4829.81013.95824.9Tertiary169.979.72.39.9Household size $1-4$ 4427.31825.06226.65 - 87848.44258.312051.59 - 123924.41216.75121.9Mean6666Occupation 7 9.754.552.8Farming8552.84258.312754.5Civil servant3018.62533.35121.9Years of 26.6 58.35121.9Experience1 - 5116.856.9166.96 - 103219.91013.94218.111 - 153521.71520.85021.416 - 205534.23143.18636.921 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean141515156.441,000 - 60,00053.134.283.49,000 - 159.379.7229.531,000 - 40,000 <td< td=""><td>Widowed</td><td>43</td><td>26.7</td><td></td><td>12</td><td>167</td><td></td><td>55</td><td>23.6</td><td></td></td<>	Widowed	43	26.7		12	167		55	23.6	
Level None 14 8.7 8 11.1 22 9.4 Primary 83 51.6 47 65.3 130 55.8 Secondary 48 29.8 10 13.9 58 24.9 Tertiary 16 9.9 7 9.7 23 9.9 Household size	Educational	15	20.7		12	10.7		55	25.0	
None148.7811.1229.4Primary8351.64765.313055.8Secondary4829.81013.95824.9Tertiary169.979.7239.9Household size 1^{-4} 4427.31825.06226.6 $1-4$ 4427.31825.06226.6 $5-8$ 7848.44258.312051.5 $9-12$ 3924.41216.75121.9Mean6666OccupationFarming8552.84258.35121.9Years of I^{-5} 116.856.9166.9Experience $1-5$ 116.856.9166.9 $6-10$ 3219.91013.94218.1 $11-15$ 3521.71520.85021.4 $16-20$ 5534.23143.18636.9 21 and above2817.41115.33916.7 $20000 - 30,000$ 159.379.7229.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 1811.21216.730.1 $41,000 - 50,000$ 4628.62636.17230.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 563.134.283.4 <td>Level</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Level									
Note116.76711112779.7Primary8351.64765.313055.8Secondary4829.81013.95824.9Tertiary169.979.7239.9Household size	None	14	87		8	11.1		22	94	
Image of the secondary4829.81013.95824.9Tertiary169.979.7239.9Household size $1-4$ 4427.31825.06226.6 $1-4$ 4427.31825.06226.6 $5-8$ 7848.44258.312051.5 $9-12$ 3924.41216.75121.9Mean666Occupation79.754.553.6Farming8552.84258.312754.5Civil servant3018.62533.35523.6Trading4628.658.35121.9Years ofVars ofExperience1113.94218.111 - 153521.71520.85021.411 - 153521.71520.85021.411 - 153521.71520.85021.411 - 153521.71520.85021.412 - 14 above2817.41115.33916.7Mean14151515Annual income1115.33916.720,000 - 30,000159.379.7229.531,000 - 40,0001811.21216.73012.941,000 - 50,0	Primary	83	51.6		47	65.3		130	55.8	
Decomposition169.979.72.39.9Household size1101072039.9 $1-4$ 4427.31825.06226.6 $5-8$ 7848.44258.312051.5 $9-12$ 3924.41216.75121.9Mean666Occupation7754.5Farming8552.84258.3127Fasting4628.658.35121.9Years of77166.96Experience $1-5$ 116.856.916 $1-5$ 116.856.91414 $1-5$ 534.23143.18636.9 21 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean141515156.4 $20,000 - 30,000$ 159.379.7229.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 1811.21216.73012.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 4628.62636.17230.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 53.134.283.4 $91,000 - 7,000$ 106.256.9156.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 116.845.6156.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 53.134.28 </td <td>Secondary</td> <td>48</td> <td>29.8</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>13.9</td> <td></td> <td>58</td> <td>24.9</td> <td></td>	Secondary	48	29.8		10	13.9		58	24.9	
Household size $1 - 4$ 44 27.3 18 25.0 62 26.6 $1 - 4$ 44 27.3 18 25.0 62 26.6 $5 - 8$ 78 48.4 42 58.3 120 51.5 $9 - 12$ 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 Occupation 6 6 6 Farming 85 52.8 42 58.3 127 Fading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of $1 - 5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $1 - 5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $1 - 15$ 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16 - 20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 6.4 $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 $30.12.9$ $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 16 <t< td=""><td>Tertiory</td><td>16</td><td>99</td><td></td><td>7</td><td>97</td><td></td><td>23</td><td>99</td><td></td></t<>	Tertiory	16	99		7	97		23	99	
noncentral size $1-4$ 44 27.3 18 25.0 62 26.6 $5-8$ 78 48.4 42 58.3 120 51.5 $9-12$ 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation 7 54.5 52.8 42 58.3 127 54.5 Civil servant 30 18.6 25 33.3 55 23.6 Trading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of Experience 7 15 20.8 50 21.4 11 - 15 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 16 - 20 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 15 6.4 10.00 72 30.9 16.7 Mean 14 <td>Household size</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td>2.1</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> <td><i></i></td> <td></td>	Household size	10			,	2.1		20	<i></i>	
1-4 44 27.5 18 25.0 02 26.6 $5-8$ 78 48.4 42 58.3 120 51.5 $9-12$ 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 Occupation 7 51.5 21.9 Farming 85 52.8 42 58.3 127 54.5 Civil servant 30 18.6 25 33.3 55 23.6 Trading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of Experience 1 5 51 21.9 7 $1-5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $1-5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $1-1$ 15 20.8 50 21.4 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 5 $20,000$ $30,000$	Housenoid size	11	27.2		10	25.0		()	26.6	
3-8 78 48.4 42 58.5 120 51.5 $9-12$ 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean 6 6 6 6 6 Occupation 51.2 21.9 61.5 61.5 61.5 Farming 85 52.8 42 58.3 127 54.5 Civil servant 30 18.6 25 33.3 55 23.6 Trading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of $1-5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $1-5$ 31.5 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16-20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 15 Mean 14 15 15 6.4 72 30.9 12.9 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18	1 - 4	44 79	27.3		18	23.0		02	20.0	
9-12 39 24.4 12 16.7 51 21.9 Mean666Occupation $ -$ Farming 85 52.8 42 58.3 127 54.5 Civil servant 30 18.6 25 33.3 55 23.6 Trading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of $ 16$ 6.9 $6-10$ 32 19.9 10 13.9 42 18.1 $11-15$ 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16-20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 15 Annual income $ 15$ 15 $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $1,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000$ $ -$	3 - 8	/8	48.4		42	38.5		120	21.0	
Mean6666Occupation $Farming$ 8552.84258.312754.5Civil servant3018.62533.35523.6Trading4628.658.35121.9Years of $Farming$ 8656.9166.9Experience1 - 5116.856.9166.96 - 103219.91013.94218.111 - 153521.71520.85021.416 - 205534.23143.18636.921 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean14151515 $20,000 - 30,000$ 159.379.7229.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 1811.21216.73012.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 4628.62636.17230.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 5634.81419.47030.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 106.256.9156.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 116.845.6156.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 53.134.283.4 $91,000$ 11.410.4 $100,000$ 11.410.4	9-12	39	24.4	6	12	10.7	6	51	21.9	6
OccupationFarming8552.84258.312754.5Civil servant3018.62533.35523.6Trading4628.658.35121.9Years ofExperience1-5116.856.9166.96-103219.91013.94218.111-153521.71520.85021.416-205534.23143.18636.921 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean14151520,000 - 30,000159.379.7229.531,000 - 40,0001811.21216.73012.941,000 - 50,0004628.62636.17230.951,000 - 60,0005634.81419.47030.161,000 - 70,000106.256.9156.471,000 - 80,000116.845.6156.481,000 - 90,00053.134.283.491,00011.410.4100,00011.410.4	Mean			6			6			6
Farming 85 52.8 42 58.3 127 54.5 Civil servant 30 18.6 25 33.3 55 23.6 Trading 46 28.6 5 8.3 51 21.9 Years of 1 5 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $6 - 10$ 32 19.9 10 13.9 42 18.1 $11 - 15$ 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16 - 20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 Annual income 22 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 72 100 233 100	Occupation									
Civil servant3018.625 33.3 55 23.6 Trading4628.65 8.3 51 21.9 Years ofExperience $1-5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $6-10$ 32 19.9 10 13.9 42 18.1 $11-15$ 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16-20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean14 15 15 15 $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 72 100 233 100 10	Farming	85	52.8		42	58.3		127	54.5	
Trading4628.658.35121.9Years ofExperience $1-5$ 116.856.9166.9 $6-10$ 3219.91013.94218.1 $11-15$ 3521.71520.85021.4 $16-20$ 5534.23143.18636.921 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean141515Annual income20,000 - 30,000159.379.7229.531,000 - 40,0001811.21216.73012.941,000 - 50,0004628.62636.17230.951,000 - 60,0005634.81419.47030.161,000 - 70,000106.256.9156.471,000 - 80,000116.845.6156.481,000 - 90,00053.134.283.491,00011.410.4100,000Total16110072100233100	Civil servant	30	18.6		25	33.3		55	23.6	
Years ofExperience $1-5$ 116.856.9166.9 $6-10$ 3219.91013.94218.1 $11-15$ 3521.71520.85021.4 $16-20$ 5534.23143.18636.921 and above2817.41115.33916.7Mean141515Annual income20,000 - 30,000159.379.7229.531,000 - 40,0001811.21216.73012.941,000 - 50,0004628.62636.17230.951,000 - 60,0005634.81419.47030.161,000 - 70,000106.256.9156.471,000 - 80,000116.845.6156.481,000 - 90,00053.134.283.491,00011.410.4100,000Total16110072100233100	Trading	46	28.6		5	8.3		51	21.9	
Experience $1-5$ 11 6.8 5 6.9 16 6.9 $6-10$ 32 19.9 10 13.9 42 18.1 $11-15$ 35 21.7 15 20.8 50 21.4 $16-20$ 55 34.2 31 43.1 86 36.9 21 and above 28 17.4 11 15.3 39 16.7 Mean 14 15 15 Annual income $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000$ $ 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 161 100 72 100 233 100	Years of									
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Experience									
	1 - 5	11	6.8		5	6.9		16	6.9	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6 – 10	32	19.9		10	13.9		42	18.1	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11 – 15	35	21.7		15	20.8		50	21.4	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16 - 20	55	34.2		31	43.1		86	36.9	
Mean141515Annual income20,000 - $30,000$ 159.379.7229.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 1811.21216.73012.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 4628.62636.17230.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 5634.81419.47030.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 106.256.9156.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 116.845.6156.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 53.134.283.4 $91,000 -$ 11.410.4100,000Total16110072100233100	21 and above	28	17.4		11	15.3		39	16.7	
Annual income101010 $20,000 - 30,000$ 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 72 100 233 100	Mean			14			15			15
20,000 - 30,000 15 9.3 7 9.7 22 9.5 $31,000 - 40,000$ 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 72 100 233 100	Annual income			11			10			10
23,000 - 40,000 18 11.2 12 16.7 30 12.9 $41,000 - 50,000$ 46 28.6 26 36.1 72 30.9 $51,000 - 60,000$ 56 34.8 14 19.4 70 30.1 $61,000 - 70,000$ 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 $71,000 - 80,000$ 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 $81,000 - 90,000$ 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 $91,000 1$ 1.4 1 0.4 $100,000$ 72 100 233 100	20,000 - 30,000	15	93		7	97		22	95	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	31,000 - 40,000	18	11.2		12	167		30	12.9	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41000 - 50000	46	28.6		26	36.1		72	30.9	
61,000 - 70,000 10 6.2 5 6.9 15 6.4 71,000 - 80,000 11 6.8 4 5.6 15 6.4 81,000 - 90,000 5 3.1 3 4.2 8 3.4 91,000 - - - 1 1.4 1 0.4 100,000 Total 161 100 72 100 233 100	51,000 - 60,000	56	34.8		14	19.4		70	30.1	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	61,000 - 70,000	10	62		5	69		15	64	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	71,000 - 80,000	11	6.8		4	5.6		15	6.4	
91,000 - - - 1 1.4 1 0.4 100,000 - - 1 1.4 1 0.4 100,000 - - 100 72 100 233 100	81 000 - 90 000	5	31		3	4.2		8	3.4	
100,000 1 1 1 0.4 Total 161 100 72 100 233 100	91 000 -	-	-		1	14		1	0.4	
Total 161 100 72 100 233 100	100 000				Ŧ	1.7		1	0.1	
101 100 12 100 233 100	Total	161	100		72	100		233	100	
Mean 605.808 590.412 601.055	Mean	101	100	605.808	12	100	590.412	200	100	601.055

Table 1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of women farmers in the LGAs

Source: Field survey, 2020

Table 2: Types of Agricultural Activity engaged in by women in the two LGAs								
Variables	Emo	hua	Obio/Akpor P		Poo	ooled		
Types of agricultural activities respondents are involved in	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
Crop farming alone	86	53.4	48	66.7	134	57.5		
Crop farming and fishing	37	23.0	10	13.9	47	20.2		
Crop farming and livestock	38	23.6	14	19.4	52	22.3		
Total	161	100	72	100	233	100		
Source: Field survey, 2020								

Table 2: Types of Agricultural Activity engaged in by women in the two LGAs

Table 3: Logit regression estimates of of determinants of credit access in the study area

Variables	B Statistic	Standard Error	P-Value
Age	0.169	0.204	0.407
Marital Status	0.447**	0.162	0.006
Household Size	0.016	0.390	0.967
Educational Level	-0.088	0.337	0.795
Occupation	0.464	0.327	0.157
Farming Experience	-0.205	0.165	0.216
Type of Farming Activity	2.504**	0.417	0.000
Monthly Income	-0.037	0.178	0.837
Constant	-5.463***	1.072	0.000
-2 Log likelihood	175.257		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.447		
Pseudo R Square	0.605		
Chi-Square	3.864		

Source: Authors computation from SPSS

** and *** is significant at 5% and 1% level

References

- DAW and UNIFEM (2001). United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). The situation of rural women within the context of globalization Report of the Expert Group Meeting 4 - 8 June 2001, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.
- Eghosa, L. O. (2015). The Role of Women in Agricultural Production in Ovia Southwest Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. Unpublished Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Eze, C.C., Ibekwe, C.U. and Korie, C.O. (2009). Women's accessibility to credit from selected commercial banks for poverty reduction in Southeast Nigeria.17th International Farm Management Congress, Bloomington/Normal, Illinois, USA Peer Review Paper.
- Eze, C.C., Lemchi, J.I., Ugbochukwu, A. I., Eze, V. C., Awulonu, C.A.O. and Okon, A. X. (2010).
 Agricultural Financing Policies and Rural Development in Nigeria, *The 84th Annual Conference of Agricultural Economics Society*, Edinburgh. 29th to 31st March 2010.
- FAO (2011). The role of women in agriculture. ESA Working Paper No. 11-02 March 2011 Agricultural Development Economics Division The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 48pp. www.fao.org/economic/esa.
- Harun, M. E. (2014). Women's workload and their role in agricultural production in Ambo District, Ethiopia. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, 6(8): 356-362.

- Iruonagbe, C. T. (2010). Land ownership patterns and the economic life of women: A study of Ozalla community, Edo State, Nigeria. Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft & Co.KG.
- John C.I. and Charles K.O. (2015). Agricultural Credit Sources and Determinants of Credit Acquisition by Farmers in Idemili Local Government Area of Anambra State. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology*, 5 (1): 34-43.
- Nyamba, S.Y. and Mlozi, M.R.S. (2012). Factors Influencing the Use of Mobile Phones in Communicating Agricultural Information: A Case of Kilolo District, Iringa, Tanzani, International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Research, 2(7): 558-563.
- Obe-Nwaka, M. O., Okidim, I. A. and Agbagwa, S. K. (2020). Access to Farm Credits Among Women Farmers in Obio-Akpor and Emohua Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Research and Technology*, 9(12): 19–29.
- Okidim, I.A. and Obe-Nwaka, M.O. (2021). Microcredit acquisition among small-scale fish farmers in Obio-Akpor Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Sustainable Agricultural Development*, 2(3):17–28.
- Onwualu, A.P. (2012). Agricultural Sector and National Development; Focus on Value Chain Approach. A paper presented at the 5th edition of the Annual Lecture of Onitsha Chamber of Commerce at Sharon House GRA, Onitsha.
- Oriaku, B.N. (2010). Access to and Investigation of Formal Micro credit by small Holder Farmers in Abia State: A case Study of ABSU micro finance

Bank, Uturu. A B.Agric project submitted to the department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Abia State University, Uturu.

- Sahel (2014). The Role of Women in Nigerian Agriculture, Newsletter, 7: 1-3. Available online at http://www.sahelcp.com/files/Sahel%20Newslette r,%20Volume%207.pdf
- Samson, A. and Obademi, O. (2018). The determinants and impact of access to agricultural credit on productivity by farmers in Nigeria; Evidence from Oyo State, Nigeria. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(3): 252-265.
- Sigler, J. (2017). Animal-Based Agriculture Vs. Plant-Based Agriculture: A Multi-product Data Comparison. Retrieved from the Humane Herald W e b s i t e : https://humaneherald.files.wordpress.com/2017/0 4/animal-vs-plant-based-agriculture3.pdf.
- UN (1992). United Nations. Developing Agricultural Extension for Women Farmers. World Bank Discussion.
