



## Determinants of Youth's Participation in Agricultural Enterprises in Rural Communities of Ogun State, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Ogunsola, J.O., <sup>2</sup>Oladeji, J.O., <sup>1</sup>Alarape A.B., <sup>1</sup>Aluko, O.J., <sup>1</sup>Ogunsola, A.J

<sup>1</sup>Federal College of Forestry, Jericho Hills, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Corresponding Author's email: [omotola\\_ogunsola@yahoo.com](mailto:omotola_ogunsola@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

Agriculture is a source of livelihoods for most rural people, but majority of the rural populace face many hurdles such as lack of access to credit and other resources necessary to earn a livelihood. However, despite the opportunities available in agriculture, unemployment rate and rural-urban migration is still high and on the increase. This study was designed to identify the determinants of youth participation in agricultural enterprises in Ogun State, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 125 farmers (youths) for the study. A well-structured questionnaire was used in collecting the data and data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results show that many (30.4%) were between 30-34 years of age, majority (59.2%) of the respondent recorded household size 1-3 persons. Majority (52.0%) of the respondents are into farming as their primary occupation, 83.2% strongly agree that agricultural enterprise reduced dependency on government and the community, 83.2% noted subsidy on fertilizer is not available, 96.8% indicated highly benefited on increase in self-worth, 79.2% encountered poor returns to investment as the severe constraint, 96.0% were fully involved in cassava production, while 95.2% participated in maize production. These youths are confronted with different challenges constraining their participation in agricultural enterprises. Hence, access to credit facilities, increase in farm size will enable youths to participate in the available enterprises, thereby, increasing youth participation in agricultural enterprises and assist them to attain the efficient point on the production frontier.

**Keywords:** Youth, Rural, Determinant, Agricultural Enterprise

### Introduction

Agriculture is the economic mainstay of the majority of households in Nigeria from the inception of the first decade after independence in 1960 (Loto, 2011). It is one of the most viable sectors particularly in terms of its employment potentials. It is the foundation for the development of stable human communities, both in rural and urban communities (Preshstore, 2013). Agriculture is a source of livelihoods for an estimated 86% of rural people and agriculture is the backbone of the rural economy, generating about 35% of gross domestic product (GDP) and providing by far the largest source of rural employment (Simeon and Marinos, 2015). However, Aphunu and Atoma (2010) positioned that continuous reliance on the aging population could negatively impact agricultural production. Due to the evolving production and business environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, efforts to increase participation of the younger generation in agriculture have been increasing. The population of youths in the world is about 1.2 billion and it is projected to increase to 1.3 billion by 2030 (UN, 2019). Youths make up to one-fifth of the population in

many countries of the world (ILO, 2017). African youths population is nearly 200 million and it is the highest globally (UNDP, 2017). Nigeria's population is estimated at 205,856,089 people in 2020 (UN, 2019), and about half of its population is made up of youths between 14 to 34 years of age (NBS, 2017).

Nigeria's National Youth Development Policy (NYDP, 2009) defined the youth as comprising all young persons of age 18 to 35 years. As the youth population grows, so does the unemployment rate and this is not supposed to be. The unemployment rate of adults in developing countries is less when compared to that of youth (ILO, 2020). The rate of youth unemployment in sub-Saharan Africa is a major problem yet to be overcome (World Bank, 2020). According to Bertow and Schultheis (2007), youth occupy a critical position in production and development of any nation. They possess the entrepreneurial potential to combine and utilize the other factors such as land, labour, machineries and inputs in an efficient and effective manner to achieve sustainable food production. It suffices therefore that,

equipping the youth with the right education, new agricultural techniques and technology will in no small measure effectively and efficiently increase agricultural production (Thomas and Fadipe, 2016). Despite the fast growing opportunities in agricultural sector, youths' unemployment is the cause of the Nigerian problem which has degenerated to youth vulnerability, thereby, leaving them with little or no option than to go into armed robbery, militancy, kidnapping, theft, prostitution and other social vices in the nation.

Poor institutional framework to harness the potentials of youth in developing agriculture and lack of attractive practice of the traditional system of farming has been a major bane to youth attraction and making career in agriculture (Adebayo *et al*, 2006). These problems have led to unemployment, rural-urban migration, and static agricultural productivity and loss of manpower in agricultural sector. There is need to ensure replacement of the aging farmers by young and energetic youths, thereby, reducing rural-urban migration, youth vulnerability, reducing proliferation of youth-based social vices such as armed robbery, kidnapping, prostitution etc., and increasing agricultural productivity vis-à-vis the increase in manpower. Increased involvement of youth in agricultural enterprises reduces the problem of aging farmer population and increase youth employment (Adigun *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, this study was designed to establish how the agricultural enterprise can be used to reduce the menace of rural unemployment, rural-urban migration and how rural youths can tap into the opportunities provided by agriculture.

### **Methodology**

The study was carried out in Ogun State, Southwestern, Nigeria. The population of the study comprised of all rural youths of age 18 to 35 years involved in agricultural activities in the study area. Multi-stage sampling technique was used in selecting respondents. Ogun State is divided into four zones by the Ogun State Agricultural Development project (OGADEP), namely; Abeokuta, Ikenne, Ilaro and Ijebu-Ode. Abeokuta and Ikenne were randomly selected from the four zones. Abeokuta zone has two (2) extension blocks, while Ikenne zone has four (4) extension blocks. Then, one (1) extension block was randomly selected from each zone. There is an average of seven (7) cells in each block; three (3) cells were randomly selected from each block. Finally, simple random sample was used to get the sampling frame for this study. A total of 40% proportionate sample of registered youth farmers was randomly sampled to give a total of 125 respondents. Data was obtained from primary source using structured questionnaire consisting of open and close-ended questions. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics which include; frequency count, percentage and mean.

### **Results and Discussion**

#### ***Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents***

Table 1 presented the analysis of respondent's personal

characteristics. The result shows that majority of the youths were within 30-34 years, and this implies great physical strength which make them active and could enhance their participation in Agricultural enterprises. The result also shows that 66.4% of the respondents were males, while 33.6% were females. This indicates that male respondents were more involved in agricultural enterprises than the female respondents in the study area. As indicated in Table 1, 4.8% of the respondents had informal education, 27.2% primary education, 56.0% Secondary education, while 12.0% had Tertiary education. The dominance of secondary school and above revealed that majority of the respondents had average communication skill which is an added advantage to their participation in agricultural enterprises. Majority (64.8%) of the respondents were married. This revealed that majority of the farmers understands the implication of shouldering responsibility for people and family. The results revealed that respondent were primarily farmers (52.0%), majority of all the respondents (87.2%) are not member of any agricultural organization, while 12.8% are members. This may be based on their level of interest in organization.

#### ***Enterprise characteristics of respondents***

The result in Table 2 shows that 59.2% of the respondents have farm size of 1-3acres, 24.0% have 4-6acres and 16.8% 7 acres and above. The mean farm size of 1.58±0.76 implies that level of capital in establishing a farm will determine the size of farm a farmer will have. The result shows that 74.4 % has farm experience of 1-10years, 20.0% 11-20years, and 5.6% 21-30years. The result revealed that 15.2% owned the land used (Sole Ownership), 5.6% bought the land they use, 60.8% Leased and 18.4% Inherited. This affirms Michler and Shively (2015) assertion that the right on land and the resources are related to improved access to institutional credit, improved investments in agricultural land, higher productivity and higher farm output and rural income. Majority of the respondents (72.0%) got their information on Agriculture from the radio, followed by agricultural association (13.6%), family and friends (12.0%) and television (2.4%). This implies radio serves as one of the fastest means of information source for farmers. The result shows that 96.0% of the respondents earned an estimated income of N1- N200,000, while 0.8% had between N201,000-N400,000, then 3.2% between N401,000 and N600,000. This implies that the level of investment will determine the level of income.

#### ***Attitude towards Agricultural Enterprise***

The results in Table 3a revealed that 83.2% of the respondents strongly agree that Agricultural enterprise reduced dependency on government and the community. This implies that being involved in agricultural enterprise brings more of self-worth, dignity and reduced unemployment rate and over-dependency on Government. About 74.4% of the respondents strongly agree that Agricultural enterprise is greatly influenced by economic recession. This implies that economic recession has a great influence on

agricultural activities, and 55.2% strongly agree that engagement in agricultural enterprise adds up to their self-esteem. This implies that respondents understand the opportunities involved in agricultural enterprise. Respondents were however unfavourably disposed to the following statements; 73.6% strongly agree that Agricultural enterprise is meant for uneducated youth and 69.6% strongly disagree with the statement that I am too young to engage in agricultural enterprise. From the result in Table 3b, 44.0% of the respondents had favourable attitude towards agricultural enterprises, while 56.0% had unfavourable attitude. The responses show that participants are satisfied with engagement in agricultural enterprise, it reduced dependency on government, increase their self-sufficiency and make them self-reliant. These results support those of Adesina and Favour (2016) whose analysis found that attitude of the youths was one of the key factors that significantly influenced youth engagement in agricultural activities. The study therefore recommended that efforts to involve youths in agriculture must start by changing their attitude towards farming.

#### ***Incentive available from Government for Agricultural Production***

Table 4a revealed that 83.2% of the respondents indicated Subsidy on fertilizer is not available, 86.4% on Provision of modern agricultural tools like subsidized tractor hiring service, Credit facilities and Provision of chemical for pest control. The least ranked are Access to advisory services from research institution and Access to production input. The results agree with those of Muthomi (2017) who indicated that majority of the youths were considering venturing into agribusiness, but were hindered by lack of credit among other things. Njeru and Bernard (2014) also noted that many youths were willing to engage in agribusiness activities, but faced a lot of obstacles which include lack of land and credit to finance their startups.

#### ***Benefit derived from Participating in Agricultural Enterprises***

Table 5a revealed that 96.8% of the respondents highly benefited from participating in agricultural enterprise through increase in their self-worth, 92.8% highly benefited from participating in agricultural enterprises because it provides a sense of belonging and 88.8% highly benefited through increase in their income. This implies that the participants in agricultural enterprise benefitted directly from engaging in agricultural enterprises. These benefits are economic and psychological benefits. Observation from the responses of the respondents also shows that there is inadequate support by the participants, as Access to credit facilities to expand farming is 60.0%, Diversification of investment within agricultural enterprises 67.2% and Revenue from agri-business has impact on youth participation in agri-business 70.4%. Furthermore, level of benefit categorization is that 56.8% has low benefit, while 43.2% has high benefit. This implies that the benefit derived from the participation in Agricultural Enterprises is very low and this will affect the

participation of the youth in agricultural activities.

#### ***Participation in Agricultural Enterprises***

The results on Table 6 revealed that 96.0% of the respondents were fully involved in Cassava production, 95.2% in Maize production, 81.6 % in Yam production and 72.0% in Vegetable production. However, 75.2% of the respondents were not involved Rice production, 71.2% in Cocoa production, 74.2 % in Oil palm production and 62.4% in Poultry production. From the whole result, it can be deduced that cassava, maize, yam and agricultural processing have full involvement of the youth in agricultural activities, while others have high number of youths not involved in all other agro-enterprises. The categorization of the participation into high and low revealed that high participation gives 81.6%, while low participation gives 18.4%. This implies that the level of participation of the youth in agricultural enterprises is high, and it will be well appreciated if various incentives are available to boost their production.

#### ***Conclusion***

Based on the findings, it was observed that youths participated well in agricultural enterprises. They see agricultural enterprises as their source of income and means of survival. This can be confirmed by their attitude towards agricultural enterprises. This study indicated that poor returns to investment, continuous poor harvest, poor storage facilities and low rainfall were the most severe constraint to participation in agricultural enterprise in the study area. They actively participated in cassava production, maize production, yam production, agricultural processing and vegetable production. Thus, access to credit facilities and increase in farm size will encourage youths to participate in agricultural enterprises. The study therefore recommends that Government should introduce programmes that will encourage the youths to remain in agricultural enterprises; the programmes should also address the plight of the youths who are the majority of the farmers in the area. Government and policy makers should formulate and implement policy on land tenure system that will give youths adequate access to farming land. Contract and out-growing farming system should be developed as a way of ensuring consistent market and steady agriculture output prices. There is also need for trainings as this will enable them to learn new skills and knowledge in new varieties of farming and how they can engage more in it for optimal productivity and better income. Effort should be made by the Government to reach out and give loans, modern agricultural tools and other incentives to genuine qualified youths interested in agricultural activities so that they can expand their farm and also get good return on investment.

#### ***References***

Adebayo, K., Awotunde, M., Okuneye, P.A. and Okonkwo, U. V. (2006). Assessment of secondary school agricultural education programme in the rural areas of Imo State. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology*, 6(1/2): 13-22.

- Adesina, T. K. and Favour, E. (2016). Determinants of participation in youth-in-agriculture programme in Ondo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 20(2), 104-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jae.v20i2.8>
- Adigun, G. T, Bamiro, O.M. and Oyetola, A. (2016). Youth participation in Agricultural Production in Oyo state. *18<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the Nigeria Association of agricultural Economists*, Pp. 914.
- Aphunu, A. and Atoma, C.N. (2010). Rural Youths' Involvement in Agricultural Production in Delta Central Agricultural Zone: Challenge to Agricultural Extension Development in Delta State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 14 (2): 46-55.
- Bertow, K. and Schultheis, A. (2007). *Impact of EU's Agricultural Trade Policy on Smallholders in Africa*. Germanwatch Publisher: Bonn, Germany. Pp64.
- ILO (2017). International Labour Organisation. *Global Unemployment Trends for Youths 2017*.
- ILO (2020). International Labour Organisation. *Global Employment Trends for Youth 2020*.
- Loto, M. A. (2011). The Impact of Economic downturn on the performance of Agricultural Export in the Nigeria Economy; A Quarterly Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Emerging trends in Economic and Management Sciences*, 2 (6): 504-510
- Muthomi, E. (2017). *Challenges and opportunities for youth engaged in agribusiness in Kenya*, [Doctoral dissertation, United States International University - Africa]. <http://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/handle/11732/3273;jsessionid=95EE58AD1153FA1C1D7481ABE4A56B6A>.
- NBS (2017). National Bureau of Statistics. *Labour force statistics* (No. 476). Abuja: The NBS Publication. Retrieved August 23, 2018, from <http://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng>.
- Njeru, K. and Benard, M. G. (2014). Influence of access to land and finances on Kenyan youth participation in agriculture: a review. *International Journal of Development and Economic Sustainability*, 2(3): 10-24. <https://www.eajournals.org>.
- Michler, J. D. and Shively, G. E. (2015). Land Tenure, Tenure Security and Farm Efficiency: Panel Evidence from the Philippines. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 66(1): 155-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12082>
- Preshstore (2013). *Improving Agricultural Production through Agricultural Cooperatives*. Retrieved from <https://preshstore/status/.com> on 27th July 2015.
- Thomas, K.A. and Fadipe, M.O. (2016). *Determinants of youth involvement in Agricultural SMEs in Ogun state*. Masters project, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- UNDP (2017). United Nations Development Programme. *Africa's defining challenge*.
- UN (2019). United Nations. *International Youth Day, August 12, 2019*. United Nation's Department of Economics and Social Affairs.
- UN (2019). United Nations. *World population prospects 2019*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Dynamics.
- World Bank (2020). *Youth unemployment rate for developing countries in sub-Saharan Africa*.

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents by Personal Characteristics**

| <b>Characteristics</b>               | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> | <b>Mean</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| <b>Age</b>                           |                  |                   |             |
| 15-19                                | 16               | 12.8              | 28.3040     |
| 20-24                                | 15               | 12.0              |             |
| 25-29                                | 34               | 27.2              |             |
| 30-34                                | 38               | 30.4              |             |
| 35-39                                | 21               | 16.8              |             |
| 40 and above                         | 1                | 0.8               |             |
| <b>Total:</b>                        | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Sex</b>                           |                  |                   |             |
| Male                                 | 83               | 66.4              |             |
| Female                               | 42               | 33.6              |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Religion</b>                      |                  |                   |             |
| Christian                            | 70               | 56.0              |             |
| Muslim                               | 51               | 40.8              |             |
| Traditional                          | 4                | 3.2               |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Education</b>                     |                  |                   |             |
| Informal                             | 6                | 4.8               |             |
| Primary Education                    | 34               | 27.2              |             |
| Secondary Education                  | 70               | 56.0              |             |
| Tertiary Education                   | 15               | 12.0              |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Marital Status</b>                |                  |                   |             |
| Single                               | 42               | 33.6              |             |
| Married                              | 81               | 64.8              |             |
| Widowed                              | 2                | 1.6               |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Family Size</b>                   |                  |                   |             |
| 1-3                                  | 74               | 59.2              |             |
| 4-6                                  | 30               | 24.0              |             |
| 7 and above                          | 21               | 16.8              |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Primary Occupation</b>            |                  |                   |             |
| Farming                              | 65               | 52.0              |             |
| Trading                              | 34               | 27.2              |             |
| Artisan                              | 22               | 17.6              |             |
| Civil Servant                        | 4                | 3.2               |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Parent/Guardian Occupation</b>    |                  |                   |             |
| Farming                              | 100              | 80.0              |             |
| Trading                              | 19               | 15.2              |             |
| Artisan                              | 1                | 0.8               |             |
| Civil Servant                        | 5                | 4.0               |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |
| <b>Agric Organization Membership</b> |                  |                   |             |
| No                                   | 109              | 87.2              |             |
| Yes                                  | 16               | 12.8              |             |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>125</b>       | <b>100.0</b>      |             |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*



**Table 2: Distribution of respondents' Enterprise Characteristics**

| <b>Enterprise Characteristics</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std dev.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <b>Farm size (Acres)</b>          |                  |                   |             |                 |
| 1-3                               | 74               | 59.2              | 1.58        | 0.76            |
| 4-6                               | 30               | 24.0              |             |                 |
| 7 and above                       | 21               | 16.8              |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Farming experience</b>         |                  |                   |             |                 |
| 1-10                              | 93               | 74.4              | 1.31        | 0.57            |
| 11-20                             | 25               | 20.0              |             |                 |
| 21-30                             | 7                | 5.6               |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Source of labour</b>           |                  |                   |             |                 |
| Family Member                     | 32               | 25.6              | 2.13        | 0.79            |
| Hired Labour                      | 45               | 36.0              |             |                 |
| Both                              | 48               | 38.4              |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Farm labour</b>                |                  |                   |             |                 |
| Never Available                   | 14               | 11.2              | 1.28        | 0.84            |
| Always Available                  | 79               | 63.2              |             |                 |
| Sometimes Available               | 15               | 12.0              |             |                 |
| Rarely Available                  | 17               | 13.6              |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Ownership structure</b>        |                  |                   |             |                 |
| Soul Ownership                    | 19               | 15.2              | 2.82        | 0.91            |
| Bought                            | 7                | 5.6               |             |                 |
| Leased                            | 76               | 60.8              |             |                 |
| Inherited                         | 23               | 18.4              |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Agricultural information</b>   |                  |                   |             |                 |
| Family and Friends                | 15               | 12.0              | 2.65        | 0.72            |
| Agricultural Association          | 17               | 13.6              |             |                 |
| Radio                             | 90               | 72.0              |             |                 |
| Television                        | 3                | 2.4               |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |
| <b>Income</b>                     |                  |                   |             |                 |
| 1-200000                          | 120              | 96.0              | 49920.0     | 18960.25        |
| 201000-400000                     | 1                | 0.8               |             |                 |
| 401000-600000                     | 4                | 3.2               |             |                 |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>125</b>       | <b>100</b>        |             |                 |

*Source: Field Survey 2021*

**Table 3a: Distribution of respondents by their attitude towards agricultural enterprise (n=125)**

| No | Items   | SD<br>Freq(%) | D<br>Freq(%) | U<br>Freq(%) | A<br>Freq(%) | SA<br>Freq(%) | Mean | Rank             |
|----|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------|------------------|
| 1  | Agricultural enterprise reduces restlessness  | 31 (24.8)     | 8(6.4)       | 3(2.4)       | 29(23.2)     | 54(43.2)      | 3.49 | 15 <sup>th</sup> |
| 2  | Agricultural enterprise is preferable when compared to other non-agricultural enterprise                          | 15 (12.0)     | 17(13.6)     | 13(10.4)     | 27 (21.6)    | 53 (42.4)     | 3.69 | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
| 3  | Agricultural enterprise provides a steady flow income   | 4 (3.3)       | 23(18.4)     | -            | 26 (20.8)    | 72 (57.6)     | 4.11 | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 4  | Agricultural enterprise make me self-reliant  | 10 (8.0)      | 5 (4.0)      | -            | 37 (29.6)    | 73 (58.4)     | 4.26 | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 5  | Agricultural enterprise increase self-sufficiency   | 11(8.8)       | 6 (4.8)      | 5 (4.0)      | 35 (28.0)    | 68 (54.4)     | 4.14 | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 6  | If I get job opportunity in a non-agricultural enterprise, I will leave   | 13 (10.4)     | 30(24.0)     | 16(12.8)     | 9 (7.2)      | 57 (45.6)     | 3.54 | 14 <sup>th</sup> |
| 7  | Agricultural enterprise has no contribution to my standard of living  | 32 (25.6)     | 36(28.8)     | 2 (1.6)      | 16 (12.8)    | 39 (31.2)     | 2.95 | 16 <sup>th</sup> |
| 8  | Agricultural production is not reliable   | 24 (19.2)     | 7 (5.6)      | 12 (9.6)     | 36 (28.8)    | 46 (36.8)     | 3.58 | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| 9  | I enjoy being in agricultural enterprise because it allows me to participate in other non-agricultural activities | 17 (13.6)     | 3 (3.2)      | 6 (4.8)      | 32 (25.6)    | 66 (52.8)     | 4.01 | 9 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 10 | I am too young to engage in agricultural enterprise   | 87 (69.6)     | 21(16.8)     | -            | 10 (8.0)     | 7 (5.6)       | 1.63 | 19 <sup>th</sup> |
| 11 | My engagement in agricultural enterprise adds up to my self-esteem  | -             | -            | 6 (4.8)      | 50 (40.0)    | 69 (55.2)     | 4.50 | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| 12 | I just realize that there are opportunities in agriculture  | 16 (12.8)     | 14(11.2)     | 4 (3.3)      | 29 (23.2)    | 62 (49.6)     | 3.86 | 10 <sup>th</sup> |
| 13 | Youth have no role to play in agriculture   | 80 (64.0)     | 14(11.2)     | 2 (1.6)      | 12 (9.6)     | 17 (13.6)     | 1.98 | 17 <sup>th</sup> |
| 14 | Agricultural enterprise is greatly influenced by economic recession   | 5 (4.0)       | 1 (0.8)      | 8 (6.4)      | 18 (14.4)    | 93 (74.4)     | 4.54 | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| 15 | Agricultural activities are more stressful when compared to the activities in non-agriculture                     | 12 (9.6)      | 8 (6.4)      | -            | 1 (0.8)      | 104 (83.2)    | 4.42 | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 16 | Since I have been involved in Agricultural enterprise, I have no regret   | 25 (20.0)     | 7 (5.6)      | 2 (1.6)      | 33 (26.4)    | 58 (46.4)     | 3.74 | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| 17 | I enjoy agricultural enterprise because it provides opportunities for leisure and personal enjoyment              | 4 (3.2)       | -            | 3 (2.4)      | 42 (33.6)    | 76 (60.8)     | 4.49 | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 18 | Agriculture enterprise is met for uneducated youth  | 92 (73.6)     | 5 (4.0)      | 11 (8.8)     | 3 (2.4)      | 14 (11.2)     | 1.74 | 18 <sup>th</sup> |
| 19 | Agricultural enterprise reduced dependency on government and the community  | 7 (5.6)       | -            | -            | 14 (11.2)    | 104 (83.2)    | 4.66 | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |

**Table 3b: Frequency Distribution Showing Participants Attitude towards Youth – In – Agriculture Enterprise**

| Level        | F   | %     | Mini  | Max   | Mean  | SD   |
|--------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Unfavourable | 70  | 56.0  | 51.00 | 86.00 | 69.38 | 6.86 |
| Favourable   | 55  | 44.0  |       |       |       |      |
| Total        | 125 | 100.0 |       |       |       |      |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 4a: Distribution of respondents by the Incentive available from Government for Agricultural Production**

| No | Items   | Not available<br>Freq (%) | Low availability<br>Freq (%) | High availability<br>Freq (%) | Mean | Rank            |
|----|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------|
| 1  | Credit facilities   | 110 (88.0)                | 11 (8.8)                     | 4 (3.2)                       | 0.15 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| 2  | Provision of chemical for pest control  | 110 (88.0)                | 11 (8.8)                     | 4 (3.2)                       | 0.15 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| 3  | Provision of modern agricultural tools like subsidized tractor hiring service | 108 (86.4)                | 13 (10.4)                    | 4 (3.2)                       | 0.17 | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| 4  | Subsidy on input  | 113 (90.4)                | 10 (8.0)                     | 2 (1.6)                       | 0.11 | 5 <sup>th</sup> |
| 5  | Subsidy on fertilizer   | 104 (83.2)                | 12 (9.6)                     | 9 (7.2)                       | 0.24 | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| 6  | Access to advisory services from research institution                         | 124 (99.2)                | 1 (0.8)                      | -                             | 0.01 | 7 <sup>th</sup> |
| 7  | Availability of seeds require for improved seeds                              | 118 (94.4)                | 1 (0.8)                      | 6 (4.8)                       | 0.10 | 6 <sup>th</sup> |
| 8  | Access to production input  | 124 (99.2)                | 1 (0.8)                      | -                             | 0.01 | 7 <sup>th</sup> |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 4b: Frequency distribution of respondents by the incentive available from Government for Agricultural Production**

| Level          | F   | %    | Mini | Max   | Mean | SD   |
|----------------|-----|------|------|-------|------|------|
| Low Incentive  | 102 | 81.6 | 0.00 | 11.00 | 0.96 | 2.46 |
| High Incentive | 23  | 18.4 |      |       |      |      |
| Total          | 125 | 100  |      |       |      |      |

*Source: Field Survey 2021*

**Table 5a: Distribution of respondents by Benefit derived from Participating in Agricultural Enterprises**

| No | Items   | Highly Beneficial<br>Freq (%) | Mildly Beneficial<br>Freq (%) | Not a Benefit<br>Freq (%) | Mean | Rank             |
|----|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------|------------------|
| 1  | Access to credit facilities to expand farming                                   | 75 (60.0)                     | 21 (16.8)                     | 29 (23.2)                 | 1.37 | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
| 2  | It provides a sense of belonging  | 116 (92.8)                    | 4 (3.2)                       | 5 (4.0)                   | 1.89 | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| 3  | Increase in self-worth  | 121 (96.8)                    | 3 (2.4)                       | 1 (0.8)                   | 1.96 | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| 4  | Increase in income  | 111 (88.8)                    | 14 (11.2)                     | -                         | 1.89 | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| 5  | Increase in capacity to invest in non-agricultural enterprises                  | 97 (77.6)                     | 28 (22.4)                     | -                         | 1.78 | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 6  | Promote social capital formation among rural youth                              | 108 (86.4)                    | 17 (13.6)                     | -                         | 1.86 | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 7  | Improved household food and nutrition security                                  | 110 (88.0)                    | 14 (11.2)                     | 1 (0.8)                   | 1.87 | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 8  | Improvement in the quality of well-being  | 111 (88.8)                    | 11 (8.8)                      | 3 (2.4)                   | 1.86 | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 9  | Access to acquisition of land and properties                                    | 95 (76.0)                     | 22 (17.6)                     | 8 (6.4)                   | 1.70 | 9 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 10 | Diversification of investment within agricultural enterprises                   | 84 (67.2)                     | 37 (30.8)                     | 3 (2.5)                   | 1.64 | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| 11 | Agricultural enterprise elevates one social status                              | 106 (84.8)                    | 19 (15.2)                     | -                         | 1.85 | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 12 | Revenue from Agric-business has impact on youth participation in Agric-business | 88 (70.4)                     | 30 (24.0)                     | 7(5.6%)                   | 1.65 | 10 <sup>th</sup> |

*Source: Field Survey 2021*



**Table 5b: Frequency distribution of respondents on level of benefit in Agricultural Enterprises (n=125)**

| Level | F   | %    | Mini  | Max   | Mean  | SD   |
|-------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| High  | 54  | 43.2 | 10.00 | 26.00 | 22.97 | 3.57 |
| Low   | 71  | 56.8 |       |       |       |      |
| Total | 125 | 100  |       |       |       |      |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 6a: Distribution of respondents on Participation in Agricultural Enterprises (n=125)**

| No | Agro-enterprise involved  | Not Involved<br>Freq (%) | Partial<br>Involvement<br>Freq (%) | Full<br>Involvement<br>Freq (%) | Mean | Rank             |
|----|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------------------|
| 1  | Cassava production  | 5 (4.0)                  | -                                  | 120 (96.0)                      | 1.92 | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| 2  | Maize production  | 6 (4.8)                  | -                                  | 119 (95.2)                      | 1.90 | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |
| 3  | Rice production   | 94 (75.2)                | 8 (6.4)                            | 23 (18.4)                       | 0.43 | 10 <sup>th</sup> |
| 4  | Yam production  | 21 (16.8)                | 2 (1.6)                            | 102 (81.6)                      | 1.65 | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| 5  | Vegetable production  | 25 (20.0)                | 10 (8.0)                           | 90 (72.0)                       | 1.52 | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 6  | Cocoa production  | 89 (71.2)                | 5 (4.0)                            | 31 (24.8)                       | 0.54 | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 7  | Oil palm production   | 93 (74.4)                | -                                  | 32 (25.6)                       | 0.51 | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 8  | Poultry production  | 78 (62.4)                | 32 (25.6)                          | 15 (12.0)                       | 0.49 | 9 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 9  | Fishery   | 109 (87.2)               | 4 (3.2)                            | 12 (9.6)                        | 0.22 | 16 <sup>th</sup> |
| 10 | Sheep/goat rearing  | 99 (79.2)                | 11 (8.8)                           | 15 (12.0)                       | 0.33 | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
| 11 | Guinea pig  | 117 (93.6)               | -                                  | 8 (6.4)                         | 0.13 | 20 <sup>th</sup> |
| 12 | Rabbit  | 110 (88.0)               | 5 (4.0)                            | 10 (8.0)                        | 0.20 | 18 <sup>th</sup> |
| 13 | Piggery   | 109 (87.2)               | 6 (4.8)                            | 10 (8.0)                        | 0.21 | 17 <sup>th</sup> |
| 14 | Snail production  | 102 (81.6)               | 10 (8.0)                           | 13 (10.4)                       | 0.29 | 13 <sup>th</sup> |
| 15 | Bee-keeping   | 116 (92.8)               | -                                  | 9 (7.2)                         | 0.14 | 19 <sup>th</sup> |
| 16 | Agricultural processing e.g. cassava, maize, rice, oil, melon, etc. | 23 (18.4)                | 4 (3.2)                            | 98 (78.4)                       | 1.60 | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 17 | Fish value addition   | 104 (83.2)               | 11 (8.8)                           | 10 (8.0)                        | 0.25 | 15 <sup>th</sup> |
| 18 | Marketing and distribution of different agricultural produce        | 50 (40.0)                | 19(15.2)                           | 56 (44.8)                       | 1.05 | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 19 | Supply of animal feed   | 96 (76.8)                | 15 (12.0)                          | 14 (11.2)                       | 0.34 | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| 20 | Supply of improved seed varieties                                   | 104(83.2)                | 6 (4.8)                            | 15 (12.0)                       | 0.28 | 14 <sup>th</sup> |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 6b: Frequency distribution of respondents on level of Participation in Agricultural Enterprises**

| Level | F   | %    | Mini | Max   | Mean  | SD  |
|-------|-----|------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| High  | 77  | 61.6 | 0.00 | 37.00 | 14.01 | 6.6 |
| Low   | 48  | 38.4 |      |       |       |     |
| Total | 125 | 100  |      |       |       |     |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*