

Credit sources, access and factors influencing credit demand among rural livestock farmers in Nigeria

Article

Accepted Version

Silong, A. and Gadanakis, Y. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7441-970X> (2020) Credit sources, access and factors influencing credit demand among rural livestock farmers in Nigeria. *Agricultural Finance Review*, 80 (1). pp. 68-90. ISSN 0002-1466 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/AFR-10-2018-0090> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85405/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/AFR-10-2018-0090>

Publisher: Emerald

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



Credit sources, access and factors influencing credit demand among rural livestock farmers in Nigeria.

Journal:	<i>Agricultural Finance Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AFR-10-2018-0090.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	Rural farmers, credit demand,, credit access, logit model, multinomial logit model, livestock production

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Topic: Credit sources, access and factors influencing credit demand among rural livestock**
4 **farmers in Nigeria.**
5
6

7
8 *Abstract:*
9

10 **Purpose** -- Rural farmers' access to farm credit in Nigeria has been very low, which affects
11 farm performance, and credit providers have blamed for the problem in the sector. While this
12 general perception persists, the fact may be the case of credit demand, rather than just the risk-
13 averse attitudes of credit providers. The research, therefore, sets to investigate significant
14 factors influencing farmers' credit demand to ensure efficient credit provision.
15
16

17 **Methodology** -- The research adopted mixed methods for an in-depth investigation into the
18 problem. There were 216 research participants split into equal halves of men and women from
19 six Local Government Areas of Nasarawa State. Data collection methods employed structured
20 interviews, focus group discussions, close/open-ended, and key informant interviews.
21 Analytical tools involved descriptive statistics, the logit and multinomial logit models to
22 determine participants' socioeconomic characteristics, sources of credit, access, factors
23 influencing credit demand generally, and from the various sources of credit identified.
24
25

26 **Findings** -- Findings reveal only 47.6% of the participants accessed credit, with fewer women
27 accessing than men. The most accessed forms of credit are from the semi-formal sources, with
28 more men accessing from formal sources and more women from non-formal sources. Factors
29 having significant influence on credit demand generally are education, group membership and
30 household size. And from formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit sources are 1); education,
31 information on sources of credit, deposits, household size and marital status, 2); education,
32 deposits, group membership, household size, flock size, and 3); education, group membership,
33 and gender from the non-formal credit providers, respectively.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1.0 Introduction

Scholarly findings from Shahab et al. (2018), Akudugu et al. (2011 and 2012b), Kokoye et al. (2013), and other scholars have professed credit to be a development tool so powerful to capitalize farm households to invest and adopt improved farming methods and production technologies to enhance productivity. Schindler (2010), Akudugu (2011), Deb and Suri (2013), and other scholars acknowledge that credit provides working capital particularly, in rural areas where many of the impoverished people live. Thus, credit is capable of stabilizing household consumption to reduce poverty. Scholarly findings have continued to confirm credit to transform the living conditions of beneficiaries by increasing their farm productivities to enhance income as well as boosting their self-confidence and well-being (Akudugu, 2011; Akudugu et al. (2012b). In Nigeria for example, Ogbuabor and Nwosu (2017), Emesefi and Yusuf (2014), and other scholars acknowledge credit to increase farm output significantly, hence farm family income and help the poor towards accumulating their wealth to invest in farming. It is an instrument that could possibly transform the traditional agricultural sector into modern form and create employment opportunities. Hence, credit is a critical component that could tackle productivity problems and reduce extreme poverty, supporting the generation of self-employment in the rural sector farming and non-farming activities for investment in working capital, and one of the core strategies for alleviating poverty in most developing countries (The World Bank, 2017; Tiken Das, 2018)

Livestock production particularly is known to be of massive importance to the poor and one of the principal components of the rural and national economy. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2006; 2004) and Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) (2017) acknowledge that livestock keeping diversifies production and reduces the risks of economic losses resulting from crops destroyed by adverse climatic conditions or diseases. It is a natural and economic capital which contributes to human diets and livelihoods through home consumption and income generation, acting as a live bank, imparting social status, and providing draft, transport, and fertilizer, especially for resource-poor farmers. If the production of livestock is well integrated into the household economy, it will allow more efficient use of family labour, provide a secure food and cash income spread over the entire year, and manure as fertilizer that improves the soil, thus enhancing crop production (World

1
2
3 Bank, 2009). Given the relative importance of the livestock sector to rural smallholders, one question
4 that arises is the extent to which farmers access credit to facilitate their taking advantage of developing
5 livestock production and other livelihood activities.
6
7
8

9
10 Although agriculture including livestock production remains a vital component of the country's
11 economy contributing about 41% of GDP, and employing about 70% of the active population, the
12 agricultural sector receives less than 10% of the annual budgetary allocations (Ojo and Adebayo, 2012).
13 Consequently, the sector has significantly underperformed over the years, failing to be self-sufficient
14 in supplying food in the quantity and quality to feed the continually growing population. For example,
15 Ojo and Adebayo (2012) report that food production in Nigeria increases at the rate of 2.5% per annum
16 while population increases at 2.8% which does not match the demand for food; recorded at 3.5% per
17 annum. There is widespread food insecurity in the country due to the food demand-supply gap resulting
18 in rising food prices and imports. The most significant problem in the food sector in Nigeria is that of
19 low animal protein in the diets of a large proportion of the population, especially in the rural areas where
20 about 70% of its population lives (FAO, 2017; Mubarrak et al., 2016). Among other factors responsible
21 for the precarious food insecurity such as land, agricultural research and policy, technology,
22 infrastructure, and access to support services such as extension services; Ojo and Adebayo (2012), and
23 the Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Rural Development in Nigeria (FMARD) (2008) confirm
24 inadequate financing to be the significant problem. For instance, the allocation of credit to the Nigerian
25 agricultural sector by commercial banks declined from about 10.8% of total lending in 1985 to only
26 about 3.7% in 2014 (Udoka et al., 2016). Some scholars confirm the declining trend in credit provision
27 by the financial sectors are due to the risks and uncertainties in Nigerian agriculture, especially to small
28 holders (Famogbiele, 2013; CBN, 2014). Hence, financial providers in Africa, including Nigeria, have
29 been criticised for the precarious condition of agricultural production (Alliance for a Green Revolution
30 in Africa, 2012; IFPRI, 2014). While the declining trend of credit allocation to farm households
31 in Nigeria has been reported by many scholars to be a problem of supply, it may factly be the
32 case of demand. Hence, this study seeks to understand the sources of credit to livestock farmers
33 in the region and the main factors influencing their demand for credit. The study used
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 quantitative and qualitative methodologies to critically examine the issues at hand, to
4 comprehend better factors that are most likely to lead to farmers' demand for credit in the first
5 place. Findings from the study are triangulated to achieve study objectives properly.
6
7
8
9

10
11 The use of mixed methodologies in researching problems of this nature is rare in Nigeria,
12 especially in Nasarawa state, because scholars most often use quantitative methods alone (see
13 for example; Girei et al., 2016 and Etonihu et al., 2013). The findings from this study are robust
14 and are hoped to enhance knowledge among credit providers in the region about farmers'
15 requirements for credit. Moreover, the policy recommendations would help the government
16 and financial institutions to tackle issues identified while devising financial innovations aimed
17 at sustainably providing credit services tailored to the needs of farmers (IFPRI, 2014; Adeoye
18 and Ugalahi, 2017).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **1.2 Study objectives**

31
32 **Objective I:** Identify and describe the sources and features of credit to small rural holders (particularly
33 livestock farmers)
34

35
36 **Objective 2:** Determine farmers access to credit
37

38
39 **Objective 3:** Investigate significant factors influencing farmers decision to borrow from the various
40 credit providers.
41
42
43

44 **2.0 Literature review**

45 **2.1 Financing the rural small sector farming in Nigeria**

46 Small scale production is of enormous importance to economic growth and social development
47 in Nigeria. Notably, the small rural sector is vital for the mobilisation of untapped financial
48 resources, conservation of foreign exchange, utilisation of local resources and could present
49 reliable avenues for economic integration, and the transformation of the traditional sector into
50 modern form, as well as the creation of employment opportunities. According to Owualah
51 (1998), small sector farming provides opportunities for training in skill acquisition to enhance
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proper management of livelihood activities for low-income earners. However, poor access to
4 credit has been affecting its growth. Hanson and Menezes (1971) remarked that people borrow
5 money not because they want it for their own sake but only because it gives them command
6 over goods and services. In other words, nobody will seek a loan unless they consider that the
7 value of the satisfaction to be derived from the goods or services on which the money is to be
8 spent for is at least equal to the interest that must be paid. As such, loan finances accessed by
9 the smallholders could increase family income and help the poor towards accumulating their
10 capital to invest in employment generating activities (Germidis et al., 1991).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2.2 Credit sources and features in Nigeria**

23
24 In Nigeria, the major sources of finance available to rural farmers are categorised into three
25 groups, namely; formal, semi-formal and the non-formal credit institutions. The semi-formal
26 and non-formal credit sources are further categorised as informal credit institutions/markets
27 (Badiru, 2010). Formal credit institutions consist of the country's official and commercial
28 banks such as the Nigerian Agricultural Bank (NAB), the Nigerian Industrial Development
29 Bank (NIDB), the state government-owned credit institutions and Micro Finance Institutions
30 (MFIs), Private and Merchant Banks, and Finance Houses. The semi-formal sources of credit
31 comprise of the NGOs, Cooperative Societies and support groups, farmers' associations and
32 the rotating savings and credit associations (ROSCAs). The final group are the non-formal
33 credit institutions, these sources of credit involve money lenders such as merchants, traders,
34 loan sharks, rural shop keepers, clubs and saving societies like "Esusu"; "Ajo", friends,
35 relatives, spouses and so on (Badiru, 2010; Okojie, 2010).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The formal credit institutions operate in a more structured way, providing financial services to
54 its customers based on membership deposit and collateral. These sources operate under strict
55 and complex rules and conditions for accessing credit and are deposit-based with the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 requirement of physical collateral for security. More straightforward rules operate with formal
4
5 Micro Finance Institutions, but they also require physical collateral, while the Nigerian
6
7 Agricultural Bank requires peer collateral. Thus, accessing credit from these institutions require
8
9 customers to have an account with the banks and tangible or intangible collateral security.
10
11

12
13 The semi-formal sources of credit in Nigeria are set up, owned and managed by their members.
14
15 They are also democratically operated, so their policies and programs are set to adapt to the
16
17 rural environment and their members. These sources of credit were inspired by the non-formal
18
19 system to better respond to the needs of the rural population and to correct the negative aspects
20
21 of the non-formal credit markets. The semi-formal sources of credit provide loans to local rural
22
23 and urban populations who do not have access to formal credit institutions, so that they can
24
25 obtain loans at conditions suitable to their needs and at rates which are better than the non-
26
27 formal credit sources (Badiru, 2010; Okojie et al., 2010). Lastly, the non-formal credit sources
28
29 give loans in cash or in kind to be reimbursed in cash or kind; often in agricultural produce
30
31 when advanced to farmers. Credit accessed from these sources does not usually require a
32
33 deposit relationship, and no collateral is required (Badiru, 2010). In Nigeria, generally,
34
35 commercial banks and other formal credit institutions fail to cater to the credit needs of rural
36
37 populations because of their lending terms and conditions. It is the rules and regulations of the
38
39 formal financial institutions that have generated the idea that the poor are not bankable, and
40
41 since they cannot afford the terms, they are therefore considered not creditworthy (Adera,
42
43 1995). Much effort has been invested in overcoming the widespread lack of financial services,
44
45 especially among small rural holders through the expansion of credit in the rural areas in
46
47 developing countries, including Nigeria. However, a majority still have limited access to
48
49 credit, especially from the formal credit institutions to support their private livelihood activities
50
51 (Okojie et al., 2010 and Badiru, 2010). As such, the informal sector finance remains the major
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sources of credit to the rural sector in Nigeria, which provide easier access to credit facilities
4
5 for the small rural holders.
6
7

8 **2.3 Demand for credit by the small rural holders in Nigeria and access.**

9
10 Many socio-economic factors play an essential role in determining the demand for credit by an
11 individual farmer/entrepreneur. Firstly, it is a preference, which may be influenced by factors
12 such as age, gender, marital status, education, group membership, level of income, and so on.
13
14 Secondly is the price or cost of the commodity. Thirdly is the borrower's preference among the
15 alternatives available. Just as in the theory of demand for goods and services and prices, the
16 purchasing decisions of consumers and quantity purchased is impacted by the prices of
17 commodities demanded (Saleemi, 2000; Mudida, 2003). In other words, when deciding to
18 borrow, an individual look at the cost of credit, the available alternatives, the conditions of
19 borrowing from alternatives, and the socio-economic characteristics of borrowers. These put
20 together give bases for consideration to borrow from the alternative sources. For example, if
21 borrowing from formal credit sources proves expensive, borrowers are likely to turn to informal
22 sources and vice versa. This is simply on the basis that if the cost of credit goes up, the marginal
23 utility per unit price raised from that credit goes down. The borrower, therefore, chooses to
24 either not consume or consume less of the credit. The concept of utility and marginal utility
25 explains consumer demand on a commodity. The utility is the capacity or power of a
26 commodity to satisfy the desire of a user. If credit borrowed will satisfy the financial needs of
27 a borrower, then credit has utility (Saleemi, 2000). The main objective of any borrower is to
28 maximise satisfaction out of any finances borrowed, given or self-made. As such, the
29 conditions of accessing credit from the alternative markets are taken into consideration before
30 deciding to borrow/access credit.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Conditions for accessing credit by small rural farmers in Nigeria vary from one credit
4 institution to another. For example, Badiru (2010) reports that the Central Bank of Nigeria's
5 (CBN) guaranteed loans through commercial banks require customers to have an account with
6 the bank with tangible or intangible collateral security (sometimes with savings/deposits).
7
8 Semi-formal finance institutions provide credit based on membership deposit and peer
9 collateral, and the non-formal credit providers usually do not require a deposit or collateral;
10 however, they charge high-interest rates on the basis that no collateral is provided. Sometimes
11 loans from the non-formal credit institutions may be provided in the form of production inputs.
12 It is estimated that only 2.5% of total CBN loans and advances are directed to small scale
13 farmers in Nigeria (CBN 2008; Badiru, 2010). Badiru (2010) confirms that credit amounts
14 accessed by farmers from formal credit markets vary from N20, 000.00 (approximately £40.00,
15 with intangible collateral) and up to N10, 000,000.00 (approximately £20, 000.00 with tangible
16 collateral). Credit amounts accessed from RoSCAs, Cooperative Societies, Credit Unions and
17 the NAB vary at any point in time, depending on membership strength and the total
18 contribution by the group. However, average loans from these sources vary from N5,
19 000.00 (approximately £10.00) to N20, 000.00 (approximately £40.00).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The small rural holders in Nigeria have limited ideas about the nature of formal financial
42 systems because they have little or no access to information concerning these sources. Firstly,
43 because most formal institutions perceive small rural holders as high-risk clients because the
44 subsistent nature of their production. Hence, they are hesitant to grant them loans because they
45 do not provide good enough returns. Secondly, with the problem of illiteracy and poor
46 management knowledge, smallholders are discouraged from accessing credit from formal
47 credit institutions because of the administrative procedures, paperwork and provision of
48 guarantors and collateral. Thirdly, formal finance institutions are mostly located in the urban
49 area, hence the transaction costs of transport including interest rates and time spent in an
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 application and waiting are usually too high for rural farmers. These factors among others affect
4 the integration of rural farmers into the formal finance system (Okojie et al., 2010). The
5 implication is that most of them access credit from the informal sector which is usually in small
6 amounts, short term with very high-interest charges, untimely supply, and uncondusive
7 repayment conditions (Okojie, 2010; Anyanwu, 2004; Badiru, 2010; Philip et al., 2009). As
8 such, farmers may not necessarily derive the benefit required from credit accessed from semi-
9 formal credit sources, thus, becoming financially excluded, and dependent only on their own
10 income for productive purposes which is often meagre, rendering their productive activities to
11 be marginal (Okojie, 2010, Fletcher and Kenny, 2011 and World Bank, 2008a).

24 25 **2.4 Financial literacy and their implications on credit access**

26
27 Financial literacy is about empowering and enlightening consumers so that, they are
28 knowledgeable about finance in a way that is relevant to their lives and enables them to use
29 this knowledge to evaluate financial products and make informed decisions. Moreover,
30 financial education is the process by which financial consumers improve their understanding
31 of financial products and concepts through information, instruction and objective advice to
32 enable them to develop the skills and concepts required to become aware of financial risks and
33 opportunities to make informed choices, and know where to go for financial products to
34 minimise risks (Collins and O'Rourke, 2010). Financially educated consumers would benefit
35 the financial sector to make a useful contribution to real economic growth and poverty
36 reduction. Building financially literate and capable populations through financial education
37 could have enormous future benefits for any economy (Guiso and Viviano, 2015).

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Many scholarly findings in Nigeria indicate that most smallholder farmers have a limited understanding of financial products and services. A survey in 2008 showed that about 80% of Nigerians do not have bank accounts with formal financial institutions which make them

1
2
3 financially excluded. This is due to their low-income status, low level of education, and low
4
5 level of financial literacy (Credit Awareness Nigeria.com, 2013).
6
7

8
9 In a country with a diverse social and economic profile like Nigeria, financial literacy is
10
11 particularly essential for rural people. A better understanding of how the financial markets
12
13 work, what they offer, as well as how to utilise financial products could create a viable financial
14
15 system. Building financial capacity through financial education in Nigeria will help consumers
16
17 to acquire the skills and knowledge to be confident, self-reliant and capable of making their
18
19 own financial decisions thereby helping them to assume more responsibility in their financial
20
21 decisions while minimising risks as they navigate the financial markets to ensure the smooth
22
23 functioning of the financial markets (Credit Awareness Nigeria.com, 2013).
24
25
26
27

28 **3.0 Materials and methods**

29 **3.1 Description of the study location**

30
31
32 The study location is Nasarawa State in Nigeria, which is centrally located in the middle belt region of
33
34 the country with state capital in Lafia (Marcus and Binbol, 2010). Nasarawa state falls within the
35
36 southern guinea savannah zone characterized by a tropical sub-humid climate with two distinct seasons;
37
38 the wet season, lasting about six months (May – October) and the dry season occurring between
39
40 November and April, with annual rainfall figures ranging from 1100mm to about 2000mm.
41
42 Temperatures are generally high during the day, particularly between March and April with mean
43
44 monthly temperatures ranging between 20°C and 34°C (Marcus and Binbol, 2010; Rahman et al., 2010).
45
46 The main economic activity in Nasarawa State is agriculture. The state is rich with fertile agricultural
47
48 land, rivers, streams, as well as a large active population that can sustain a highly productive agrarian
49
50 sector. The principal crops grown include maize, rice, sorghum, millet, cowpea, groundnut, yam,
51
52 cassava, soybeans, oil palm, beniseed, melon, and bambara nuts. The livestock industry plays a very
53
54 significant role in the physical and socio-economic wellbeing of the population (Rahman et al., 2010),
55
56 with a considerable number of different livestock species in the state including cattle, goats, sheep, pigs,
57
58 rabbits and poultry (Ibid).
59
60

1
2
3 Nasarawa state consists of three senatorial districts: west, central and south senatorial districts, and
4 thirteen local government areas. The southern senatorial district includes five LGAs; Karu, Keffi,
5 Kokona, Nasarawa, and Toto. The central senatorial district consists of Akwanga, Nasarawa Eggon,
6 and Wamba LGAs and the western senatorial district consists of Awe, Lafia, Keana, Doma and Obi
7 LGAs (ibid). The state has a total land area of 27,137.8 square kilometres and a population of about 1.8
8 million people, with a density of about 67 persons per square kilometre (NPC, 2016; Marcus and Binbol,
9 2010).

19 **3.2 Approach to the study, data sources and collection strategies, and sampling procedure**

20 The study adopted the pragmatist paradigm using mixed methodologies in its inquiry. Structured
21 interviews consisting of closed and open-ended questions, focus group discussions (FGDs), and key
22 informant interviews (KIIs) were instruments used for primary data collection. The multistage sampling
23 techniques were adopted for the selection of a total of 216 research participants from six Local
24 Government Areas (LGAs); Obi, Lafia, Nasarawa Eggon, Kokona, Akwanga and Karu, and 18 villages
25 who were used for the survey. Participants of various FGDs conducted were recruited with the help of
26 Fadama III desk officers and livestock assistants of the various livestock units of the six LGAs
27 investigated. There were at least two farmers; men and women from each of the three villages examined
28 in each LGA involved in the FGDs to ensure representation. The KIs were two staff each from credit
29 institutions picked up at random in the LGAs investigated.

43 **3.3 Field data collection**

44 First, structured questionnaires consisting of closed and open-ended questions were administered to 216
45 selected respondents in six LGAs of Nasarawa State, where quantitative and qualitative data were
46 obtained. The survey covered aspects such as the socio-economic characteristics (SECs) of participants,
47 their sources of credit, conditions for accessing credit, and reasons for not accessing credit. Questions
48 were carefully planned and considered beforehand to achieve research objectives and were pre-tested
49 and refined before administering. Interviews enabled the examining of the participants' depth of
50 understanding of the subject matter and were useful with regards to contacting large numbers quickly
51 and replicating interviews to produce standardized and reliable form data. However, because questions

1
2
3 are predetermined, the depth of responses was limited to the set questions. To upset this; a guide
4 reflecting the study objectives was used for FGDs. Participants of various FGDs conducted were
5 recruited with the help of the desk officers of Fadama III Project and livestock assistants of the livestock
6 units of each of the six LGAs investigated. There were at least two farmers; male and females from
7 each of the three villages investigated in each LGA involved in the FGDs to ensure representation.
8 Through FGDs, members participated in discussions to explore sources of credit, access, factors
9 influencing demand for credit, reasons for not accessing credit and other sources of income for investing
10 in livestock production. Thirdly, KIIs were used to obtain information from carefully selected credit
11 providers who are thought to have in-depth knowledge about credit facilities and mode of access. The
12 KII guide reflected the objectives of the study. KIIs conducted enabled the researcher to acquire some
13 knowledge about the credit facilities available to farmers in the study area and explored further on the
14 conditions these institutions apply when granting loans to farmers. This information was used to
15 determine factors that farmers are likely to consider given the conditions of access and alternatives
16 available to them before deciding to borrow.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

3.4 Data analysis

3.4.1 Examining credit sources and features, and factors influencing access

33
34
35
36
37 The various sources of credit, their features and access to farmers have been identified through surveys
38 and KIIs. Also, research participants were asked to indicate the factors that affect their decision to
39 borrow from the different sources identified, and these were corroborated with data from KIIs. Factors
40 identified were then modelled using the logit and multinomial logistic regression models (MNLML).
41
42
43
44
45
46

a. The logit model (LM)

47
48
49 The study employed the threshold decision-making theory proposed by Hill and Kau (1973) and
50 Pindyck and Rubinfeld (1998), in the logit model. The application of this theory in the context of this
51 study is that; given a specific set of factors; there is a reaction threshold that borrowers must reach
52 before making loan decisions. Thus, at a value of stimulus below the threshold, there will be no decision
53 to borrow, while at the critical threshold value, borrowing is observed.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

This reaction is modelled using the relationship:

$$Y_i = \beta X_i + u_i \quad (1.1)$$

Where Y_i is equal to one (1) when a decision is made to borrow and zero (0); otherwise; this means:

$Y_i = 1$ if X_i is greater than or equal to a critical value, X^* ; and $Y_i = 0$ if X_i is less than a critical value, X^* .

X^* represents the combined effects of the independent variables (X_i) at the threshold level. Equation 1.1 represents a binary choice model involving the estimation of the probability of credit access (Y_i) as a function of independent variables (X_i).

The empirical model for the logit estimation is specified as follows:

$$y_i = \log \frac{P_i}{1-P_i} = \alpha + \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1.2)$$

Where Y_i is the observed response for the i^{th} observation of the response variable, Y .

$\log \frac{P_i}{1-P_i}$ Are the log-odds in favour of farmers' decision to access credit.

$Y_i = 1$ for farmers who decide to borrow

And

$Y_i = 0$ for those who decide not to borrow), and

X_i 's = factors that promote or prevent farmers' access to credit; X_1 - X_{15} , and are defined as follows:

X_1 = Age in years (+)

X_2 = Age in years squared (-)

X_3 = Flock size in numbers (+)

X_4 = Marital status of farmer, dummy (1= Married: 0= Single) (+)

X_5 = Collateral requirements (perception), dummy (1= if credit access depends on collateral; 0= Otherwise) (+)

1
2
3 X_6 = Education (years) (+)
4

5 Primary= 1-6 years
6

7 Secondary=7-12 years
8

9 Tertiary= >12
10

11
12 X_7 = Deposit requirements (perception) (1= if credit access depends on deposits; 0=Otherwise) (+)
13

14 X_8 = Interest rate (perception) (1= if access to credit depends on interest rate: 0=Otherwise) (+)
15

16
17 X_9 = Farming experience (years) (+)
18

19 X_{10} = Access to extension/veterinary services (+)
20

21
22 X_{11} = Group membership, dummy (1 = having group membership; 0 = Otherwise) (+)
23

24 X_{12} = Income level (perception), dummy (1 = if access to credit depends on income level;
25

26
27 0 = Otherwise) (+)
28

29
30 X_{13} = Household size (numbers) (+)
31

32
33 X_{14} = Information on sources of credit, dummy (1 = having information on credit sources; 0 =
34

35 Otherwise) (+)
36

37
38 X_{15} = Gender: dummy (1 =men and 0= women) (+).
39

40 ε = the error term assumed to be normally distributed.
41

42
43 The signs in parentheses indicate the *a priori* expectations of the direction of change in the probability
44 of access to credit due to a unit change in any of the explanatory factors in the model.
45

46 47 48 **b. The multinomial logit model (MNL)** 49

50 To be able to assess the factors that affect farmers' decision to borrow from either of the three credit
51 sources identified, the MNL was applied. In this scenario, the decision makers were faced with choices
52 involving more than two alternatives. If a farmer were to access credit from these three choices; formal,
53 semi-formal and non-formal credit sources, which one option does he/she choose? In each of these
54 scenarios, the observed decision is related to a set of explanatory variables. The estimation and
55
56
57
58
59
60

interpretation of the MNLM are, in principle, like the logit model; to predict the probability that an individual with a particular set of characteristics chooses one of the alternatives. For example, given that a farmer obtained a loan, what is the likelihood that they would choose one of the three alternatives; formal, semi-formal or non-formal credit providers? The factors affecting this choice are variable. As in the logit model, the probability that the i th farmer will choose alternative j is as follows:

$$P_{ij} = \mathbf{P} [\text{individual } i \text{ chooses alternative } j]$$

With these $j=3$ alternatives, denoted by $j=1, 2$, or 3 .

Assuming there is a single explanatory factor, X_i , then, in the multinomial logit specification, the probabilities of individual i choosing alternatives $j= 1, 2$, or 3 are:

$$P_{i1} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\beta_{12} + \beta_{22}x_i) + \exp(\beta_{13} + \beta_{23}x_i)}, \quad j=1 \quad (1.3a)$$

$$P_{i2} = \frac{\exp(\beta_{12} + \beta_{22}x_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{12} + \beta_{22}x_i) + \exp(\beta_{13} + \beta_{23}x_i)}, \quad j=2 \quad (1.3b)$$

$$P_{i3} = \frac{\exp(\beta_{13} + \beta_{23}x_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{12} + \beta_{22}x_i) + \exp(\beta_{13} + \beta_{23}x_i)}, \quad j=3 \quad (1.3c)$$

The parameters β_{12} and β_{22} are specific to the second alternative, and β_{13} and β_{23} are specific to the third alternative. The parameters specific to the first alternative are set to zero to solve an identification problem and to make the probabilities sum to one. Setting $\beta_{11} = \beta_{21} = 0$ leads to the 1 in the numerator of P_{i1} and the 1 in the denominator of each part of (1.3). Specifically, the term that would be there is $\exp(\beta_{11} + \beta_{21}) = \exp(0 + 0x_i) = 1$. A distinguishing feature of the multinomial logit model in (1.3) is that there are explanatory variables describing the individual, *not* the alternatives facing the individual. Such variables are individual specific (X_i). To distinguish the alternatives, different parameter values are considered. For example: Let Y_{i1} , Y_{i2} and Y_{i3} be indicator variables representing the choice made by

1
2
3 individual i . If alternative 1 is selected, then $Y_{i1} = 1$ and $Y_{i3} = 0$ and $Y_{i2} = 0$. If alternative 2 is selected,
4 then $Y_{i1} = 0$, $Y_{i2} = 1$, and $Y_{i3} = 0$. In the MNLM, everyone must choose one, and only one of the
5 available alternatives. As in the logit, the estimation of this model is by maximum likelihood estimation
6 (MLE). Suppose that three individuals choose alternatives 1, 2, or 3, respectively.
7
8
9

10 11 12 **3.4.2 Choice of variables used for the logit and MNL estimation and justification for** 13 **inclusion**

14
15 The age of farmers X_1 measured in years is used as a proxy for maturity and experience in farming (X_9)
16 and implies the potential ability to perform productive work and utilize and repay credit. It is expected
17 that age would have a positive influence on credit access because as farmers grow older, they acquire
18 more experience in production, therefore becoming confident in accessing credit for investment in their
19 productive activities (Shahab et al., 2018 and Fakayode and Rahji, 2009). Age squared (X_2) was included
20 in the analysis to test for the quadratic nature of age. The assumption is that as farmers grow to pass
21 their economically active age, their involvement in economic activities including accessing productive
22 resources and credit would decline, thus would be negatively associated with access to credit all things
23 being equal. Flock size measured as count of livestock in numbers (X_3) was included in the model as a
24 proxy for scale of operation which could influence credit access decisions -- increase in scale of
25 operation would increase revenue, thus credit access and vice versa (Jiao et al., 2018; Abedullah et al.,
26 2009). Marital status of farmers (X_4) was used as a proxy for the agency of respondents. Given that in
27 the study area, marital status determines the type of economic activity one engages in and the number
28 of people in a household (X_{13} ; measured in numbers). The expectation was that it would positively
29 influence credit access decisions of farmers, and it was measured as a dummy (1 = married and 0 =
30 single). Household size (X_{13}) was included in the model because farmers with large household sizes are
31 more likely to access credit than those with small household sizes because of the possibility of having
32 readily available farm labour from family members which might reduce the cost of production and
33 increase profit to guarantee credit repayment all things being equal (Shahab et al., 2018; Silong, 2017).
34 Collateral (X_5) was included in the model because most formal lenders require borrowers to provide
35 collateral as security to access credit. This variable was measured as a dummy (1=where collateral is
36 required and 0= otherwise). The expectation was that farmers would be less likely to access credit where
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 collateral is required (Ololade and Olagunju (2018). Education (X_6) is very important in accessing and
4 controlling productive resources including credit and one of the major factors that influence the decision
5 to participate in and access credit (CBN, IFC and World Bank, 2017 and Lukytawati, 2009). Education
6 in this study is considered in the model in three stages (primary education 1-6 years, secondary
7 education; 7-12 years and tertiary education as >12 years). The expectation was that acquiring more
8 years of formal education and financial literacy would be associated with an efficient credit application
9 and could increase farmers' probability of accessing credit (Silong, 2017; Shahab et al., 2018). Deposits
10 (X_7) are deemed important in accessing credit because people who have deposits as savings with lenders
11 can demonstrate that they can generate income to take care of their household needs and still have a
12 surplus (Samson and Obademi, 2018). It was measured as a dummy (1 for farmers who have savings
13 and 0; otherwise). It is expected that savings would influence borrowing positively. Interest rate level
14 (X_8) was included in the model because farmers who perceived that the interest charges by lenders are
15 high are less likely to access credit from them and vice versa. It was measured as a dummy (1 for farmers
16 who perceived interest rates to be high and 0 otherwise). Access to extension/veterinary services (X_{10})
17 was measured as a dummy (1 for those who have access and 0; otherwise). Extension services provide
18 farmers with the technical know-how to confidently engage in farming activities. As such, it is expected
19 that increasing access to extension/veterinary services by livestock farmers would be associated with
20 increases in access to credit (Silong, 2017). Membership of a social/support groups (X_{11}) was included
21 in the model because of the group lending approach adopted by many financial institutions, especially
22 in the rural areas. It was measured as a dummy (1 = having a membership of social/support group and
23 0; otherwise), and expected to be positively associated with increases in credit access (Silong, 2017).
24 Income level (X_{12}) was included in the model because people who perceive their income levels to be
25 low may decide not to access credit, and the reverse is true. It was measured as a dummy (1 for farmers
26 who perceived that their income levels have an influence on their decision to borrow and 0; otherwise).
27 Access to information on the available sources of credit (X_{14}) was included in the model because
28 knowing where to go for credit is likely to influence borrowing positively. This was measured as a
29 dummy (1 for those who access information on available credit sources and 0= otherwise). Finally, is
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

gender X_{15} ; it is included in the model because, in the rural context of Nigeria, men are more likely to decide to access credit than women. This was measured as a dummy (1=men and 0 =women).

4.0 Empirical results

4.1 Background information about the research participants

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of selected SEC of farmers

Socio-economic factors	Male: N=108		Female: N: 108					
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
Marital status								
Single	13	12%	16	15%				
Married	95	88%	92	85%				
Education								
No education	18	17%	45	42%				
Primary education	24	22%	31	29%				
Secondary education	46	43	20	18%				
Tertiary education n	20	18%	12	11%				
Access to extension / veterinary services								
<i>Had access</i>								
	55	51%	40	37%				
<i>Had no access</i>	53	49%	68	63%				
Group membership								
<i>Have no group membership</i>	52	66.7%	72	66.7%				
<i>Have group membership</i>	22	33.3%	36	33.3%				
Access to credit								
<i>Not accessed credit</i>	52	48.1%	61	56.5%				
<i>Formal credit</i>	22	20.4%	10	9.3%				
<i>Semi-formal credit</i>	28	25.9%	21	19.4%				
<i>Non-formal credit</i>	6	5.6%	16	14.8%				
	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation
<i>Age</i>	20	78	38	13.6	20	79	39	12
<i>Household size</i>	2	35	14	7	2	31	14	6
<i>Farming experience</i>	2	48	9	9	2	30	7	5.5
<i>Formal education</i>	0	17	9	5	0	16	5.3	5.3
<i>Flock size</i>	5	91	19	14.4	5	78	16	14.6

The study participants were split equally between genders to account for gender differences in SECs as well as in their demand for credit. Descriptive statistics reveal the mean age of the sampled male and

1
2
3 female farmers to be 38 and 39 years, with a minimum of 20 years and a maximum of 78 and 79 years
4
5 for male and female farmers respectively. Male and female farmers have on average 9 and 7 years of
6
7 experience in small ruminant production respectively with a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 48
8
9 and 30 years for male and female farmers respectively. 88% of male and 83% of female participants are
10
11 married. Analysis of the household sizes reveal mean household sizes of 14 and 13 for both male and
12
13 female farmers, with a minimum of 2 per household, and a maximum of 35 and 31 members for male
14
15 and female farming households respectively, and both genders have household sizes in the range of 10-
16
17 19 members. Many of the sampled female participants have acquired up to 5 years of formal education
18
19 up to a maximum of 16 years, and up to 9 years for male farmers with a maximum of 17 years. Overall,
20
21 144 of the respondents, comprising 72 each of male and female farmers have group membership with
22
23 the remaining 36 each of male and female participants having none. Also, 56 men corresponding to
24
25 52% of the sample of male participants accessed credit with 20.4%, 25.9% and 5.6% accessing from
26
27 the formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit institutions respectively.
28
29

30
31 On the other hand, 47 females corresponding to 44% accessed credit with 9.3%, 19.4% and 14.8%
32
33 accessing from the formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit institutions respectively in the production
34
35 years investigated (2010 and 2011). 51% and 37% of male and female participants have contacts with
36
37 extension/veterinary services. The distribution of respondents' flocks' size reared showed an average
38
39 of 19 for male farmers with a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 91 and an average of 16 with a minimum
40
41 of 5 and a maximum of 78 for women. Findings also reveal that 31% of women had flock sizes in the
42
43 range of 6-10 compared to 33% of men having flock sizes in that range.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.2 Sources of credit to research participants and their features

Table 2 Credit sources and access by gender

Credit institutions	Men N=108		Men with access to credit N=56	Women: N=108		Women with access to credit N=47	Total N =216		Total men and women with access to credit N=103
	Frequency	%		%	Frequency		%	%	
Formal credit institutions	22	20%	39%	10	9%	21%	32	15%	31%
Semiformal credit institutions	28	26%	50%	21	19%	44%	49	23%	48%
Non-formal credit institutions	6	6%	11%	16	15%	34%	22	10%	21%
Total	56	52%	100%	47	44%	100%	103	48%	100%

Study findings reveal three primary providers of credit to farmers; the formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit providers, and farmers have choices of where to access credit. Official providers of credit comprise the commercial banks (private, and public or government banks, and the NAB). Semi-formal credit providers comprise of NGOs, farmers' social/support groups and cooperatives, the rotating savings and credit associations (ROSCAs), the Fadama groups, and faith organizations. And the non-formal credit providers to farmers comprise friends, relatives, spouses, merchants, village shopkeepers, traders, and other money lenders. The formal credit lenders are primarily made up of the formal financial institutions, specifically official banks licensed to operate as such. These credit providers operate within formal environments and have structured procedures that borrowers and depositors are required to follow to access financial products and services. These laid down systems are regulated and supervised by the central bank of Nigeria (CBN); financial services and products that these financial institutions provide include savings, credit, and insurance, among others. Formal credit providers such as banks often offer large sums, and their loan conditions are such that rural farmers often find it difficult

1
2
3 to meet --this is mainly due to unnecessary administrative procedures that the farmers, especially
4 women, find difficulty managing because of their low level of educational attainment.
5
6

7
8 Descriptive analysis reveals that the average years of formal education acquired by women is five years
9 compared to nine years for men (see Table 1). Thus, farmers, especially women, are more likely to
10 struggle with paperwork and administrative procedures (Fletschner and Kenny, 2011; Fletschener,
11 2009; Okojie et al. 2010). According to KIIs, the issues of high interest rates charged by institutional
12 lenders especially the commercial banks and the need for borrowers to pledge real collateral as security
13 before credit is accessed also results in many rural farmers being excluded from form credit systems as
14 smallholders (IFPRI, 2014). The semi-formal credit providers consist of microfinance institutions,
15 credit unions, financial NGOs, RoSCAs and farmers' cooperatives and social/support groups. These
16 quasi-financial institutions are licensed to operate with less stringent requirements compared to the
17 formal financial institutions. Specifically, the RoSCAs and other support groups provide loans to
18 farmers who are registered members. These groups obtain funds by pooling resources from the
19 registered members over time through savings, which are usually disbursed at a cost (interest rate
20 charges), to members in need. Other ways by which social groups provide loans to their members is by
21 pooling capital resources from individual members to make deposits in private, public or government
22 bank accounts or accounts of faith-based organizations and NGOs, and as groups attract lump sums of
23 money which are disbursed to interested members at a price. These groups may also present joint
24 collateral to institutional lenders to attract lump sums of loans, which are usually paid to interested
25 members, and repayments made at the agreed period with interest charges.
26
27

28
29 Non-formal credit providers are made up of friends, spouses, relatives, and moneylenders, such as rural
30 shopkeepers, traders, and merchants. These credit providers play a crucial role in financing the activities
31 of farmers. Loans given to farmers by non-formal lenders are usually in forms of cash or production
32 inputs (most often drugs, vaccines and other agro-chemicals from shopkeepers) and are preferable
33 because of proximity and timeliness of delivery. That notwithstanding, credit from non-formal
34 providers are short-term and are most often associated with high costs, especially if borrowed from
35 moneylenders or merchants (Badiru, 2010; Okojie et al., 2010).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Quantitative findings reveal the dominant sources of credit to participating farmers are those accessed
4 from semi-formal credit providers (48% access), followed by formal credit providers (31%) and the
5 least are those obtained from the non-formal credit providers (21%), with more males (52%) than
6 females (44%) accessing credit during the production years investigated. Also, 39%, 50% and 11% of
7 male participants obtained credit from formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit providers
8 respectively, and 21%, 44% and 34% of female participants did that from the formal, semi-formal and
9 non-formal credit providers respectively. Except for non-formal credit, fewer women had accessed
10 credit from the formal and semi-formal credit providers in comparison to men. This finding is consistent
11 with those of Quisumbing and Pandolfelli (2009), Philip et al. (2009) and Saka et al. (2008), who also
12 confirm female farmers' lower access to credit in comparison to men in Sub-Saharan Africa and
13 Nigeria. This is attributed to several factors including lack of ownership and control over productive
14 assets such as land and equipment to offer as collateral, as well as limited education, mobility, and more
15 importantly cultural and social barriers (Rossi and Lambrou, 2008; Quisumbing and Pandolfelli, 2009).
16 Qualitative findings support this; many farmers acknowledged that semi-formal lenders can be easily
17 accessed due to proximity and are prompt in credit delivery; more so, their repayment conditions are
18 flexible and could be negotiated and renegotiated. This, as in the empirical literature helps to overcome
19 some of the critical barriers to accessing credit by rural people (Okojie et al., 2010; Fletschner and
20 Kenny, 2011; Quisumbing and Pandolfelli, 2009).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

4.3 Factors influencing participants' demand for credit

42 The logit model has been used to analyse factors generally influencing participants' demand for credit.
43
44 The application of the logit theory in the context of this study is that given a particular set of factors,
45 there is a reaction threshold that borrowers must reach before making loan decisions. Thus, at a specific
46 value of stimulus below the threshold, the individual will not decide to borrow while at the critical
47 threshold value, a reaction is stimulated, and borrowing is observed.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

Table 3 Logistic regression results of farmers' access to credit

Factors	Logit model	
	Coefficients	Standard Error
Age	0.012	0.014
Age Square	-0.000	0.000
Flock Size	0.001	0.002
Marital Status	-0.019	0.092
Collateral	-0.036	0.094
Primary Education	0.313***	0.084***
Secondary Education	0.491***	0.084***
Tertiary Education	0.626***	0.101***
Deposit	0.107	0.070
Interest Rate	0.041	0.076
Farming Experience	-0.001	0.005
Extension & Veterinary services	0.11	0.094
Group membership	0.119***	0.069***
Income level	-0.014	0.085
Household size	0.010**	0.005**
Information on credit sources	0.047	0.086
Gender	-0.129	0.069
Constant	-0.404	0.330

***sig. at 1%, **sig.at 5%. *= sig.at 10%

Results on Table 3 reveal farmers' decision to access credit is significantly influenced by their education (primary, secondary and tertiary education all significant at 1% levels), group membership (sig. at 1%) and household size (sig.at 5%). For a participant farmer that has attended primary education versus a participant with no education, the log of odds of accessing credit increases by 0.313. Similarly, the log of odds will increase by 0.491 and 0.626 for those that have attended secondary and tertiary education respectively; and all are statistically significant at 1% level of significance. Based on the preceding, it is expected that acquiring more years of formal education will be positively associated with a decision to borrow, access to credit and vice versa. To bolster this, qualitative findings reveal loans from the official credit providers are extended to only people who are involved in waged labour and have accounts with the banks through which their salaries are deposited. Most often, those involved in waged labour would have acquired at least 12 years of formal education and would have had bank accounts opened through which their wages are received. It is also expected that obtaining formal education would be positively associated with financial literacy required to be efficient with application processes and the use of credit. Participants with group membership versus those with no membership change the log of odds by 0.119 of accessing and this is significant at the 1% level of statistical significance. Higher

1
2
3 household size influences the probability of credit access positively, for the fact that there would be
4 readily available family labour among farmers with higher household sizes for timely execution of
5 important farm activities, this would reduce costs of production and contribute to higher yields which
6 will guarantee loan repayment. Specifically, as expected, it was found that as farmers grow to pass their
7 economically active age group due to old age (age squared), they are less likely to access credit, as they
8 do not expect to be productive enough to pay back credit borrowed. Also, women who are single are
9 less likely to access credit. Qualitative findings revealed that single women have no husbands to stand
10 in for them to guarantee access to credit. It is also expected that participants who are single would be
11 less likely to borrow as they may not have large household sizes expected to provide the labour
12 requirement on their farms. This is very likely as qualitative findings reveal the major source of labour
13 in the study area is household labour. When farmers are required to provide collateral to be able to
14 access credit, their probability of accessing credit is negatively affected. Farmers and KIs generally
15 indicated that collateral requirement is mostly a constraint to accessing credit -- some farmers admit
16 they do not want to pledge collateral to the banks as they fear to lose them in case of anything going
17 wrong. They believe the landed properties they own belong to their immediate and extended families
18 and should pass it on from generation to generation, and for that, will not relegate control to lenders for
19 whatever reason.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Contrary to the a priori expectations, farming experience failed to lead to increases in access to credit;
thus, increases in years of farming experience may entail increases in flock sizes, and rural farmers may
not see the need to borrow to invest on their farms for increased proceeds. Increase in farming
experience could be used as a proxy for increases in age, which at some point (age square as the study
specifies) would decrease efficiency and influence borrowing negatively. Qualitative findings from
some male farmers who have failed to borrow reveal borrowing is against their religion as Muslims,
and others did say they have enough flock numbers and landed properties for their children to inherit
when they pass on, as such, would not want to lose their dignity by having their debtors harass their
children after death.

4.4 Exploring factors influencing access to credit from the existing credit providers

1
2
3 The multinomial logit model (MNL) has been applied in this context because the research participants
4 are faced with more than two alternatives, i.e., if a farmer were to access credit from any of the three
5 alternatives; formal, semi-formal and non-formal credit institutions, what would be the probability of
6 accessing credit from either one given that there are factors influencing such decisions? In each of these
7 cases, the observed choice is related to a set of explanatory variables. The MNL specifically predicts
8 and explains the probability that an individual with a certain set of characteristics chooses one of the 3
9 alternative credit markets; Y1, Y2, and Y3. Y1 = formal credit institutions, Y2 = semi-formal credit
10 institutions, Y3 = non-formal credit institutions, and Y4 = non-access respectively.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4. Factors influencing access to credit from various credit providers (MNLN)

	Y ₁ (Formal credits institutions)				Y ₂ (Semi formal credit institutions)				Y ₃ (Non-formal credit institutions)			
	Coefficients	Standard Error	Marginal Effects		Coefficients	Standard Error	Marginal Effects		Coefficients	Standard Error	Marginal Effects	
			Coefficients	Standard Error			Coefficients	Standard Error			Coefficients	SE
Age	0.113	0.140	0.000	0.011	0.166	0.114	0.011	0.012	0.251	0.200	0.013	0.014
Age Square	-0.001	0.002	-0.000	0.000	-0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.000	-0.003	0.003	-0.000	0.000
Flock Size	0.002	0.020	-0.000	0.001	0.011	0.016	0.000	0.001	0.032	0.018*	0.002	0.001*
Marital Status	-2.412	1.337*	-0.228	0.111**	0.438	0.740	0.102	0.081	0.608	0.742	0.060	0.050
Collateral	1.244	0.904	0.118	0.074	-0.026	0.658	-0.019	0.071	-0.864	0.818	-0.075	0.056
Primary Education	1.543	0.901*	0.043	0.073	3.062	0.787***	0.293	0.081***	1.085	0.844	0.004	0.058
Secondary Education	2.627	0.862***	0.110	0.661	3.625	0.831***	0.306	0.081***	2.343	0.830***	0.073	0.053
Tertiary Education	3.705	1.007***	0.192	0.073***	3.761	0.918***	0.277	0.086***	3.186	0.936***	0.120	0.054**
Deposit	0.227	0.576	-0.009	0.044	1.716	0.544***	0.221	0.052***	-1.514	0.732**	-0.144	0.047***
Interest Rate	0.426	0.650	0.038	0.055	-0.206	0.552	-0.042	0.060	0.368	0.679	0.026	0.047
Farming Experience	-0.080	0.064	-0.007	0.005	0.024	0.035	0.005	0.004	-0.056	0.077	-0.003	0.005
Extension & Veterinary services	0.589	1.003	0.023	0.084	0.919	0.796	0.084	0.086	0.346	0.836	0.001	0.057
Group membership	-0.010	0.592	-0.070	0.442	1.988	0.529***	0.199	0.048***	1.647	0.705**	0.081	0.046*
Income level	-0.593	0.710	-0.054	0.058	-0.238	0.575	-0.028	0.062	0.859	0.875	0.072	0.061
Household size	0.128	0.038***	0.009	0.003***	0.070	0.038*	0.005	0.004	-0.009	0.052	-0.003	0.003
Information on credit sources	1.200	0.521**	0.137	0.043***	-0.886	0.704	-0.116	0.073	0.904	0.968	-0.061	0.066
Gender	-0.237	0.609	0.020	0.048	-0.825	0.531	-0.052	0.055	-1.927	0.729***	-0.121	0.049***

***sig. at 1%, **sig.at 5%. *= sig.at 10%

4.5 Factors influencing access to credit from formal credit providers

Results in Table 4 indicate as farmers go beyond their economically productive years (age square), they are less likely to access credit from formal credit providers. This conforms to Akudugu et al. (2009a) and Akram et al. (2008) who reported the significance of years of age in credit delivery and access. Contrary to the a priori expectations, flock size was found to be negatively associated with the probability of farmer's access from formal credit providers, this again may be due to increases in returns from their farms due to large flock sizes, thus farmers may not see the need for borrowing; however, this is not statistically significant. Marital status of farmers has a negative relationship with access to credit from formal lenders, meaning that for a participant that is single versus a participant who is married, the log of odds of accessing credit from formal credit providers decreases by 1.337 and it is statistically significant at 10% level of significance. The implication in this study is that farmers who are married are more likely to access credit from formal credit providers than those who are single. Qualitative findings confirm that single women could not access credit because they lacked the support normally granted by spouses in the application process; -- husbands who have agreed their wives' access to credit would normally act as guarantors and support the application processes for their spouses to access credit. The variable of collateral failed to conform to the a priori expectations of having a negative influence on access to credit from formal credit providers. This means that having collateral influenced the probability of access for farmers who borrowed from formal credit providers; however, results indicate that it is not statistically significant. Education at all levels; primary, secondary and tertiary education conformed to the a priori expectation of positive influence on the probability of access to credit from formal credit providers. For a participant that has attended primary education versus a participant with no education, the log of odds of accessing credit from formal credit providers increases by 0.901, and it is statistically significant at 10% level of significance. Similarly, the log of odds will increase by 0.862 and 1.007 for those that have secondary and tertiary education respectively and are both statistically significant at 1% level of significance. Deposits made with formal credit providers met the a priori expectation of a positive relationship with 0.576 probabilities of farmers accessing credit from them. Due to the savings before credit policy by most formal credit institutions, people who saved

1
2
3 with them mostly demanded credit since the principal motive for saving with them is to get credit in
4 return. This finding of a positive effect of savings on the probability of demanding credit from the
5 formal credit providers are confirmed by Akudugu et al. (2009b) and Akram et al. (2008), however, this
6 not statistically significant. The perception of high-interest rates did not deter farmers from accessing
7 credit from formal credit providers as well. Contrary to what is expected and although not statistically
8 significant--as farmers acquire more years of farming experience, they are less likely to access credit
9 from formal credit institutions. Farmers' exposure to extension services is positively associated with
10 access to credit from formal credit providers but not statistically significant in determining access from
11 these sources in the study area. But for a participant who has access to information on sources of credit
12 versus a participant who has none; the log of odds of accessing credit increases by 0.521 and it is
13 statistically significant at 5% level of significance. This is expected because those who have information
14 about sources of credit are equipped with the knowledge to make informed choices about where they
15 access to credit. Group membership did not conform to the a priori expectation of access to credit from
16 formal credit providers; however, this is not statistically significant - study findings reveal a majority
17 of the farmers' accessed credit from the support groups they belong to. Contrary to expectation, farmers'
18 perception that those who have high-income access credit from formal credit institutions do not apply
19 in this study as they would rather invest from their income than access credit from these sources. As
20 expected, increases in household size increases the probability of farmers' access to credit from formal
21 credit providers, due to readily available family labour supply in such households, findings indicate that
22 the log of odds of accessing credit from formal credit providers by farmers who have large household
23 sizes increases by 0.038, this is statistically significant at 1% level of significance. The gender of
24 participants also conforms to the a priori expectations and confirmed by study findings. This implies
25 that rural female farmers are less likely than their male counterparts to access credit from formal credit
26 providers, this is, however, not statistically significant. This finding is consistent with Quisumbing and
27 Pandolfelli, 2009; Fletschner and Kelly (2011).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.6 Factors influencing access to credit from semi-formal credit providers

Factors which have significantly determined farmers' access to credit from semi-formal institutions are education at all levels, deposit, group membership, and household size (see Table 5.3). This indicates that for a participant that has attended primary education versus a participant with no education the log of odds of accessing credit from semi-formal credit institutions increases by 0.787. Similarly, the log of odds will increase by 0.831 and 0.918 for those that have attended secondary and tertiary education respectively and are all statistically significant at 1% level of significance. Likewise, the log of odds of accessing credit from semi-formal credit sources for participants who have deposits and group membership versus the ones who have not increased by 0.544 and 0.529 respectively, and all are statistically significant at 1% level of significance. For participants who have no group membership, the log of odds of accessing credit decreases by 0.062, and this is statistically significant at 1% level. The study investigated 72 male and female farmers each who have a membership of cooperatives or social grouping (see Table 1). Members of such groups' pool financial and human capital required for running the association, with the aim of providing affordable services to members. Both quantitative and qualitative findings also suggest that the major sources of credit to men and women are those accessed from semi-formal credit providers; most often the social groups, cooperatives, and rotating credit associations and NGO's in which farmers have a membership. This finding has also been confirmed by as Samson and Obademi (2018) in Nigeria and Akudugu (2010, 2011) in Ghana. Deposits/savings made with semi-formal credit institutions by farmers met the a priori expectation of a positive relationship with the probability of farmers accessing credit from them. Akudugu et al. (2009b) and Akram et al. (2008) acknowledged that savings form a basic requirement of accessing credit from semi-formal credit institutions, besides, this is the dominant sources of credit to participants and qualitative findings reveal deposit is the major requirement for access. As expected, the log of odds of participants with large household sizes accessing credit from semi-formal credit institutions increases by 0.038, and it is statistically significant at 10% level. Again, this might be due to readily available family labour supply in such households. Although not statistically significant in determining the probability of access to credit from semi-formal credit sources, farmers access to information on sources of credit and their gender influenced their access to these sources positively.

4.7 Factors influencing access to credit from non-formal credit providers

Factors that have a significant positive influence on participant's probability of accessing credit from non-formal credit providers were flock size, education at the secondary and tertiary levels and group membership (see Table 4). The log of odds of accessing credit from non-formal credit institutions for participants with large flock sizes versus the ones with small flock sizes would increase by 0.018, and this is significant at the 10% level of significance. The ability to have large flock sizes gives the confidence to borrow from these sources because of the ability to repay credit and sometimes in kind with livestock as it is normally the case in the study area (KIIs and FGDs). Findings reveal the log of odds of borrowing increases by 0.830 for farmers who have more than six years of education and up to 0.936 for farmers who have attained tertiary education, and these are both statistically significant at 1% level of significance. As expected, group membership positively influenced the probability of farmers' access to credit from these sources and the log of odds increases by 0.705 for farmers who have group membership. Farmers express the views that group membership means that one has the social capital and recognition in the village and therefore could easily access credit from money lenders. FGD participants and KIIs emphasized the point that borrowing from non-formal credit providers is very much dependent on relationships and social networks, hence the link with group membership. Factors that have significantly affected access negatively were deposits and gender. Findings indicate that where farmers have savings somewhere, they are less likely to access credit from these providers. Both quantitative and qualitative findings reveal - women are more likely to demand credit from non-formal credit markets than men.

Overall, the MNLM results gave an adjusted R² of 0.32, which means that all the independent variables included in the model could explain about 32% of the variations in probability of farmers accessing credit from these sources. The log likelihood ratio (LR) statistic was found to be significant at 1%, and this means that all the factors included in the MNLM estimation jointly influence the probability of farmers' accessing credit from these sources.

5.0 Conclusion and policy recommendation

1
2
3 The study used the multistage sampling technique to select 216 participants; 108 each of male and
4 females from 18 villages across the state based on the information obtained from the state ministries of
5 agriculture and cooperatives. The research adopted the pragmatists' paradigm to its inquiry employing
6 individual interviews through questionnaire administration, FGDs, and KIIs. A total of 12 FGDs were
7 also held with farmers across the sampled villages. Also, 10 KIIs from selected credit providers across
8 the study area were interviewed. The research used several research techniques, procedures, and
9 strategies based on the mixed methods paradigm, and employed analytical techniques at different social
10 strata to achieve its objectives. As such, the study used a robust approach regarding methodology to
11 ensure that valid and reliable results are obtained.
12
13

14
15
16 The study identified three primary sources of credit to participating small ruminant farmers; the formal,
17 semi-formal and non-formal credit sources. The semi-formal credit lenders are the dominant sources of
18 credit to participants with about 48% accessing credit from them. It was found that only 31% and 21%
19 of participants obtained credit from formal and non-formal credit providers respectively. Further
20 analysis by gender reveals more male than female participants accessed credit during the production
21 years involved, however, more men than females accessed credit from formal and semi-formal credit
22 providers, while more women accessed credit from the non-formal credit providers. Based on these
23 findings, it is concluded that there is a low level of access to credit from the identified sources by farmers
24 and women are more at a disadvantage in accessing credit services, especially from the formal credit
25 providers.
26
27

28
29
30 Among the factors investigated which influence participants access to credit generally, the logit findings
31 reveal that education, group membership and household size among others were positively and
32 significantly associated with participants' probability to obtain credit. Among factors found to be
33 significantly associated with access to credit from the formal credit lenders, the MNLM findings reveal
34 significant factors to be education, information on credit sources, deposits, household size, and marital
35 status.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For those who accessed credit from semi-formal credit providers; education, deposit, group
4 membership, and household size were factors that significantly influenced their access. Factors that
5 have a significant positive influence on participant's access to credit from non-formal credit institutions
6 were flock size, education, deposits, group membership and gender. As such, policies aiming to improve
7 credit access among farmers in the study area must target these principal factors. Firstly, it would be
8 helpful to encourage and support the creation of farmers groups and encourage their participation
9 through good leadership to create a conducive environment for learning. These groups could involve
10 experts to provide relevant training and the support required from the various institutions providing
11 services. These could be in the form of training to acquire new skills and knowledge on improved
12 farming methods, financial literacy; and information on financial products and services, in accessing
13 markets for inputs/outputs and services. Also, social network through group membership act as a
14 conduit for useful information sharing which is critical in mediating the relationship between an
15 institutional framework and financial inclusion (George et al., 2018). More so, group membership
16 enables members to derive the benefits associated with social collateral. In developing information
17 content and advertising materials, effort should be taken to simplify information appropriate to farmers
18 reading and numeracy skills. To improve education, more efforts could be made to develop and improve
19 rural farmers' enrolment into formal/informal education. These could be in things like developing road
20 infrastructure linking rural areas to the urban cities where schools are located and providing reasonably
21 priced transportation, and in locating schools closer. It could also be useful to revise formal financial
22 sector regulations to encourage outreach to rural areas with financial products that are safe and easy to
23 understand. This could be done by locating finance institutions in proximal distances and placing
24 emphasis on the mobilization of savings and deposits by offering a variety of savings opportunities that
25 consider the differences in farmers' needs and constraints, ensuring that the poor among them can afford
26 the minimum deposits. These institutions could consider the acceptance of both physical and social
27 collateral. Besides, these institutions could conduct market research to have a broad understanding of
28 the financial needs, and preferred products by rural farmers to develop financial services tailored to
29 their needs. Because more rural farmers and females accessed credit from informal credit providers,
30 consideration could be given to the provision of funding to informal lenders in rural communities for
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 onward lending to community members. This will help to consolidate their strengths and mitigate their
4
5 weaknesses. This is particularly important because most informal lenders are very experienced lenders
6
7 with first-hand knowledge of their local clientele. However, they are very resource constrained and are
8
9 therefore not able to lend to many borrowers. This could be achieved through the concept of credit
10
11 layering in which formal lenders delegate loan provisions to downstream lenders who have better
12
13 information on borrowers that generate high repayment rates (Rong et al., 2014). By this concept,
14
15 informal lenders could be encouraged through the appropriate policy framework to act as community-
16
17 level agents serving as intermediaries between borrowers in farming communities and the formal
18
19 financial institutions based in the cities and towns across the country. This will help to minimize issues
20
21 raised by proximity, simplify application and repayment procedures and processes, enhance timely
22
23 credit delivery and reduce transaction costs. Overall, this framework will help in the delivery of
24
25 affordable and convenient financial services to both lenders and borrowers. Also, it would be useful to
26
27 design loan packages that would encourage rural farmers to engage in more profitable economic
28
29 activities by bundling credit with additional support services like monitoring the progress of their
30
31 productive activities and connecting them with agencies or groups that would support their productive
32
33 activities.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abdulrahim, M. A., Muhammed -Lawal, A., Olasore, A. A., Oni, O. O. (2016). Assessment of Animal Protein Consumption and Food Security Among Rural Households in Kwara State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Business and Society* Vol. 1, No. 4, 2016, pp. 233-245 <http://www.aiscience.org/journal/ajbs>
- Abedullah, N. M., Khalid, M. & Kouser, S. (2009). The Role of agricultural credit in the growth of livestock sector: A case study of Faisalabad. *Pakistan Veterinary Journal*, 29, 8184.
- Adeoye, S.O. and Ugalahi, U.B. (2017). Smallholder food crop farmers' participation in Bank of Agriculture (BOA) loan scheme in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Agrosearch* Vol. 17 No. 2: 51– 66. Available <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/agrosh/article/view/163444>
- Adera, A. (1995). Instituting effective linkages between the formal and the informal financial sectors in Africa: a proposal. *Savings and Development*, 1, Pgs.5-27.
- Akram, Z., Ajmal, S. and Munir, M. (2008) "Estimation of correlation coefficient among some yield parameters of wheat under rain fed conditions" *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, Vol. 40(4), pp. 1777- 81.
- Akudugu, M. A. (2011). Rural banks' financial capital and livelihoods development of women farmers in Ghana. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 5, 248-264.
- Akudugu, M. A. (2010). Assessment of access to financial capital by rural people in Ghana: The case of the Upper East Region. *Savings and Development*, 34, 169-189.
- Akudugu, M. A., Egyir, I. S. & Akwasi, M.-B. (2009a). Access to credit from rural banks in Ghana: The case of women farmers in the Upper East Region. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 6, 142 – 167.
- Akudugu, M. A., Egyir, I. S. & Akwasi, M.-B. (2009b). Women farmers' access to credit from rural banks in Ghana. *Agricultural Finance Review*, 69, 284 – 299. Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) (2012): From strength to strength; Growing Africa's Agriculture
- Anyanwu, C.M. (2004). Microfinance institutions in Nigeria: Policy, practice, and potentials. Paper presented at the G24 Workshop on "Constraints to Growth in Sub Saharan Africa," Pretoria, South Africa, November 29- 30, 2004.
- Badiru, I. O. (2010). Review of Small Farmer Access to Agricultural Credit in Nigeria. *Nigeria Strategy Support Program Policy Note*. IFPRI, Supported by CGIAR.

- 1
2
3 Bongomin, G., Munene, J., Ntayi, J. and Malinga, C. (2018). "Analyzing the
4 relationship between institutional framework and financial inclusion in rural Uganda:
5 A social network perspective", *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Vol. 13
6 Issue: 4, pp.606-630, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJoEM-02-2017-0057>
7
8
- 9 Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the World Bank
10 (2017): *The Credit Crunch; Nigerian Financial Literacy Baseline Survey. How the*
11 *use of movable collateral and credit reporting can help finance inclusive economic*
12 *growth in Nigeria?*
13
14
- 15 Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2014). *Credit Delivery to Small and Medium Enterprises:*
16 *Post Bank Consolidation in Nigeria.* Real Sector Division Research Department
17 Central Bank of Nigeria. October 2014 AUTHORS Charles N.O Mordi Cajetan M.
18 Anyanwu Banji S. Adebusuyi Lawrence I. Odey Bandele A.G Amoo Ph.D Mbutor O.
19 Mbutor Olugbenga M. Adebayo Nkereuwem I. Akpan Nkenchor N. Igue Derek
20 Ibeagha Maximillian Belonwu Shettima T. Zimboh Ph.D.
21
22
23
- 24 Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2008). *Annual Report and Financial Statements for the*
25 *Year Ended 31st December, 2008*
26
27
- 28 Deb, R. & Suri, T. (2013). Endogenous emergence of credit markets: Contracting in
29 Response to a new technology in Ghana. *Journal of Development Economics*, **101**,
30 268-283.
31
32
- 33 Emefesi, B.O. and Yusuf, B. (2014). Access and impact of micro credit on poverty alleviation
34 among farmers in Kirfi Local Government Area of Bauchi State. *IOSR Journal of*
35 *Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS)* e-ISSN: 2319-2380, p-ISSN: 2319-
36 2372. Volume 7, Issue 11 Ver. I (Nov. 2014), PP 30-35 www.iosrjournals.org
37
38
- 39 Etonihu, K. I., Rahman, S. A. and Usman, S. (2013). Determinants of access to agricultural
40 credit among crop farmers in a farming community of Nasarawa State, Nigeria.
41 *Global Journal of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development*. Vol. 1
42 (1), pp. 060-064, November, 2013. *Global Science Research Journals*.
43
44
- 45 Famogbiele, A. (2013). *The Challenges of Agricultural Finance in Nigeria: Constraints to*
46 *Sustainable Agricultural and Economic Revival.* *International Journal of Business*
47 *and Social Research (IJBSR)*, Volume -3, No.-5.
48
49
- 50 FAO (2017). *Review of the Livestock and Milk Value Chains and Policy Influencing them in*
51 *Nigeria.* BY Ilu I. Y. Frank, A. & Annette, I. Edited by Olanrewaju B. Smith Abdou
52 Salla Berhanu Bedane
53
54
- 55 Fletschner, D. (2009). *Rural Women's Access to Credit: Market Imperfections and Intra-*
56 *Household Dynamics.* *World Development*
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fletschner, D. & Kenny, L. (2011). Rural women's access to financial services: credit,
4 Savings and insurance. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
5 Nations.
6
7
8 FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development) (2008). National
9 FADAMA Development Office, Abuja, Nigeria
10
11
12 Germidis, D., Kessler, D., & Meghir, R. (1991). Financial systems and development:
13 What role for the formal and informal financial sectors? Paris, France: OECD
14 Development Centre.
15
16
17 Girei, A. A., Ohen S. B., and Jimmy O.B. (2016). Income Analysis of Farmers with and
18 without Access to Credit in Southern Agricultural Zone, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.
19 International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology (IJEAB). Vol-1,
20 Issue-4, Nov-Dec- 2016 <http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijeab/1.4.55> ISSN: 2456-1878
21
22
23 Guiso, L., Viviano. E. (2015). How much can financial literacy help? *Rev Finance*
24 19(4):1347–1382. Doi: 10. 1093/rof/rfu033
25
26
27 Hanson D.L, and Menezes C.F. (1971). On a neglected aspect of the theory of risk
28 aversion. *Economic Enquiry: Volume 9, Issue 2.* Pgs 115–229. Western Economic
29 Association International
30
31
32 Hill, L., Kau P. (1973). Application of multivariate probit to a threshold model of grain dryer
33 purchasing decisions, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 55, 1927.
34
35
36 IFAD. (2006). Enabling the Rural Poor to Overcome Poverty in Nigeria. Available:
37 <http://www.ifad.org/operations/projects/regions/pa/factsheets/ng.pdf>.
38
39
40 IFAD (2004). Livestock Services and the Poor. IFAD, DANIDA, World Bank, DAAS,
41 University of Reading and national institutions in Bangladesh, Bolivia, Denmark,
42 India and Kenya.
43
44
45 IFPRI (2014). Loan Demand and Rationing among Small-Scale Farmers in Nigeria. IFPRI
46 Discussion Paper 01403 December 2014. Edited by Aderibigbe S. Olomola Kwabena
47 Gyimah-Brempong.
48
49
50 Kokoye, S. E. H., Tovignan, S. D., Yabi, J. A. & Yegbemey, R. N. (2013). Econometric
51 modeling of farm household land allocation in the municipality of Banikoara in
52 Northern Benin. *Land Use Policy*, 34, 72-79.
53
54
55 Kong, R., Turvey, C., Xiaolan, X., Fei, L. (2014). "Borrower attitudes, lender attitudes and
56 agricultural lending in rural China", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 32
57 Issue: 2, pp.104-129 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-08-2013-0087>.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lukytawati, A. (2009). "Factors Influencing Participation and Credit Constraints of a
4 Financial SelfHelp Group in a Remote Rural Area: The Case of ROSCA and ASCRA
5 in Kemang Village West Java", *Journal of Applied Sciences*, Vol. 9(11), pp. 2067-77.
6
7
8 Marcus, N. D. & Binbol, A. L. (2010). *Geography of Nasarawa State: A study of Flora and*
9 *Fauna. In: Akunwunmi, O., A. J. M., Onoja, A., Filabi, M. A., & Iyamoga, C.O. (ed.)*
10 *Studies in the History and Culture of the Peoples of Nasarawa State.* Ahmadu Bello
11 University Press Limited, Zaria. Nasarawa State University 2010.
12
13
14 Mudida, R. (2003). *Modern Economics* (Nairobi: Focus Publications Ltd).
15
16
17 NPC (2016). "Nigerian Population Now". National Population Commission Data for National
18 Development. <http://www.population.gov.ng/>
19
20
21 Ojo, E. O. and Adebayo, P. F. (2012). Food security in Nigeria: An overview *European*
22 *Journal of Development*. 1,2, 1999 – 222.
23
24 Ogbuabor, J. E., and Nwosu C. A. (2017). The Impact of Deposit Money Bank's Agricultural
25 Credit on Agricultural Productivity in Nigeria: Evidence from an Error Correction
26 Model. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 2017, 7(2), 513-517.
27 available at <http://www.econjournals.com>
28
29
30 Okojie, C., A., Monye-Emina, K., Eghafona, G., & Osaghae, J.O. (2010). Institutional
31 environment and access to microfinance by self-employed women in the rural
32 areas of Edo State. Washington. D.C.: International Food Policy Research
33 Institute.
34
35
36 Ololade R.A. and Olagunju F.I. (2013): Determinants of Access to Credit among Rural
37 Farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Science Frontier Research (D)*
38 13(2),17-22
39
40
41 Owualah, S.I. (1999): *Entrepreneurship in small business firm G-MAG investment Ltd.*
42 *Ikeja, Lagos. p.67.*
43
44
45 Philip, D., Nkoya, E., Pender, J. & Ono, A. O. (2009). Constraints to increasing Agricultural
46 Productivity in Nigeria. *In: (NSSP), N. S. S. P. (ed.) Sustainable Solutions for ending*
47 *Hunger and Poverty.* International Food Policy Research Institute. IFPRI, Supported
48 by CGIAR.
49
50
51
52 Pindyck, R. S., Rubinfeld, D. L. (1998). *Econometric models and economic forecasts*
53 *Business & Economics - 634 pages.*
54
55
56 Quisumbing, A. & Pandolfelli, L. (2009). Promising Approaches to address the Needs of
57 Poor Female Farmers. Washington, D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rahman, S. A., Ajayi, F. A., Okunsebor, S. A. & Yakubu, A. (2010). The Status of
4 Agriculture in Nasarawa State *in: Tinakunwunmi O., Ayuba J.M., Onoja A., Filabi*
5 *M.A. & C.O., I. (eds.) Studies in the History and Culture of the Peoples of Nasarawa*
6 *State.* Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited, Zaria, Nigeria: Nasarawa State
7 University. Rathgeber, E. M. 1990. The “WID, WAD, GAD. (1990): Trends in
8 Research and Practice. *Journal of Developing Areas*, 24 489-502.
9
10
11
12 Rahji, M. A. Y., and Fakayode, S. B. (2009). “A multinomial Logit Analysis of Agricultural
13 Credit Rationing by Commercial Banks in Nigeria”, *International Research Journal of*
14 *Finance and Economics*, Issue number 24, pp. 90-100.
15
16
17 Rossi, A. & Lambrou, Y. (2008). *Gender and Equity Issues in Liquid Bio Fuels Productions:*
18 *Minimizing the Risks to Maximize the Opportunities* Rome: FAO.
19
20
21 Saka, J. O., Lawal, B. O., Waliyat, A., Balogun, O. L. & Oyagbami, A. (2008). Effect of
22 Group Participation on Access to Micro-Credit among Rural Women in Osun and
23 Oyo States, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 121.
24
25
26 Saleemi, N. A. (2000). *Economics Simplified* (Nairobi: N.A. Saleemi Publishers).
27
28 Samson, A., & Obademi, O. (2018). The determinants and impact of access to agricultural
29 credit on productivity by farmers in Nigeria; Evidence from Oyo State, Nigeria.
30 *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(3) 252-265.
31
32
33 Schindler, K. (2010). Credit for what? Informal credit as a coping strategy of market women
34 in northern Ghana. *Journal of Development Studies*, 46, 234-253.
35
36
37 Silong, A.K.F. (2017). Credit and the Technical Efficiency of Sheep and Goat Production
38 among Rural Female Farmers in Nasarawa State, Nigeria. Unpublished thesis
39 Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
40 The University of Reading Graduate Institute of International Development and
41 Applied Economics (GIIDAE), School of Agriculture, Policy and Development
42
43
44 Tiken Das. (2018) "Does credit access lead to expansion of income and
45 multidimensional poverty? A study of rural Assam", *International Journal of*
46 *Social Economics*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-12-2017-0592>
47
48
49 Udoka, C. O., Mbat, D. O. and Duke, S. B. (2016). “The Effect of Commercial Banks’ Credit
50 on Agricultural Production in Nigeria”, *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 2016,
51 Vol. 4, No. 1, 1-10. DOI:10.12691/jfa-4-1-1
52
53
54 World Bank (2017). *Microfinance and Economic Development. Policy Research Working*
55 *Paper 8252 Development Research Group Finance and Private Sector Development*
56 *Team November 2017*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 World Bank (2009). *Minding the stock: bringing public policy to bear on livestock sector*
4 *development*. Washington, DC: 2009. Report no. 44010-GLB.
5

6 World Bank (2008a). *World Development Report*. Washington, DC.
7

8
9 Yan, J., Chen, C. and Hu, B. (2018) "Farm size and production efficiency in Chinese
10 agriculture: output and profit", *China Agricultural Economic Review*,
11 <https://doi.org/10.1108/CAER-05-2018-0082>
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Agricultural Finance Review