Assessment Of Women's Access To Infrastructural Facilities In Afijio Local Government Area Of Oyo State

Adebayo, Oyefunke. O.
Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, OgbomosoOyo State, Nigeria

Adeola Rasheed G.
Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, OgbomosoOyo State, Nigeria

Abstract:

The study examined rural women's access to infrastructural facilities in Afijio Local Government Area of Oyo State. Multistage Sampling Techniques was used to select One hundred and seventeen respondents for the study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in analyzing the data. More than half (53.0%) of the respondents were less than 50years of age. About (69.2%) were married and over (61.5%) had between 5 – 8 children. The result shows that significant relationship existed between women selected socio economic characteristics such as age (r = 0.174, P < 0.10); and years of residence (r = 0.217 P < 0.05) and access to infrastructural facilities. The study recommends that there is need for provision of basic infrastructure and amenities such as good road, rural electrification and health facilities.

Key words: Infrastructural facilities, Women, accessibility, income generating

1.Introduction

The need to provide adequate rural infrastructure in the rural areas in Nigeria cannot be over emphasized when it is realizing the fact that Nigeria's rural economy not only provides about 95 percent of the food eaten by Nigerians produce 70 percent of the non – oil exports and employs over 70 percent of the working population, but also houses a very large proportion of the poor, the malnourished the least healthy and non – literate in the society (Mafimisebi, 2002).

Providing infrastructural facilities to household and community in urban and rural areas remains a major challenge for the government and Non Government Organization (NGO). However poverty is commonly defined as the inability to attain a minimal standard of living interpreted to encompass not only consumption of food, clothing and shelter but also access to education, health services and clean water (World Bank, 2001).

Rural infrastructural development in Nigeria has long been neglected, yet investment in health, educational and water supply have largely been focused on the cities. Consequently, the rural population has limited access to services such as schools and health centers and about half of the population lack access to safe drinking water. Nigeria's rural road network has been identified as one of the poorly developed infrastructures in sub- Sahara Africa (Fakayode et al, 2008).

According to FAO (2005) rural infrastructure play a crucial role in poverty reduction, economic growth and empowerment for the rural poor in Africa. The lack of adequate and reliable infrastructure touches the life of every rural African family daily. Rural households' efforts to escape poverty and lift themselves above subsistence levels are limited by the poor access to market supplies and vital information. Investments in rural infrastructure, particularly rural roads, storage, processing and marketing facilities will therefore be required to support the anticipated growth in agricultural production industry which is the major employer of this rural populace. To this end there is need to find out women access to infrastructural facilities. The study seeks answer to the following questions;

- What are the socio – economic characteristics of rural women in the study area?
- What are the income generating activities of respondents in the study area?
- To what extent do rural women in the study area have access to infrastructural facilities?

It was hypothesized that there is no significant relationship between selected socio economic characteristics of rural women and access to infrastructural facilities.

2.Methodology

The study was carried out in Afijio Local government area of Oyo state. The local government comprises of six villages namely Awe, Fiditi, Iware, Jobele, Ilora and Ojutaye – Ijaye. Multistage sampling techniques were employed to select the respondents. At the first stage, Three (3) villages were selected randomly with the use of simple random technique. At the second stage, forty (40) households were randomly selected from each of the three villages based on their involvement in agricultural activities and this made a total of one hundred and twenty (120) households out of which one respondent were selected to make a total of 120 respondents all together. During the time of the survey three respondents were not available in the marked household which now makes a total of 117 respondents.

Structured interview schedule was used to collect data from the rural women. The data collected covered personal characteristics, income generating activities and access to rural infrastructure. The dependent variable is access to rural infrastructure facilities. The variables were considered as dichotomous. This was later measured by the three levels and scores assigned accordingly which include high access (2), Medium access (1) and low access (0).

Respondents were asked to pick accordingly to the one they have access to. This was done by listing all the available infrastructural facilities in the study area. Data collected were summarized using frequency count and percentages. The hypothesis of the study was tested using Pearson product moment correlation.

3.Results And Discussion

Table 1 shows that (53.8%) of the respondents in the study area are between 40 - 49 years with mean age of 42.3years. Also 69.2% of respondents in the study area are married while 8.6% are widow, 9.3% are divorced and 12.8% are single. Majority 61.5% of the respondent had between 5-8 children with the mean size of 5.3. This shows that respondents were still young and energetic in the study area. The implication of this to the study is that respondents will be helpful in promoting and maintaining good infrastructural facilities based on the fact that young people are receptive to development. However, majority (71.9%) of the respondents spend between 1 to 9 years

in school while only 16.2% had no formal education. The implication of this is that educational attainment promotes adoption of innovation. Result in table 1 further shows that (72.6%) of the respondents belongs to one social organization or the other. This findings support Chen et al, (2005) assertion that women constituently seek to create and join groups that will provide them with critical economic and social benefit.

Majority (67.5%) of the respondents have spent less than 20 years in the study area. Table 2 shows that 96.6% of the respondents were involved in food crop production 75.2% were into crop processing and marketing. Others were into trading 84.6% and livestock production and marketing 62.4%. This shows that rural women engaged in multiple income generating activities in the study area. This corroborates the findings of Adebayo (2010) that women contribute to the well being of their household through their income generating activities.

Result in table 3 shows access of respondents to infrastructure facilities. It was observed that 87.1% of the respondents have access to women's group, 84.6% have access to cooperative society and 76.1% of the respondents have access to market facilities. This implies that respondents in the study area will have access to soft credit facilities which will enhance their productivities.

Also 72.6% of the respondents have access to telecommunication facilities. This implies that mobile phones will make communication easier and faster and also revealed information about market situation in different parts of the area. More than half (64.1%) of the respondents have access to primary school and 57.3% to secondary school education. The implication of this finding to the study is that with poor access to educational services in rural area this may lead to poor standard of education in rural area.

Further more access to hospitals, dispensaries and maternity centre accounted for 33.3%, 41.1% and 46.2% respectively, this implies that there was a very low provision of health facilities in the study area and this may have adverse effect on their well being. However the absence of modern health facilities similarly results to poor health which will affect agricultural production among respondents. Access to water supply accounted for 48.7%. This implies that there was little supply of clean water in the study area. It is believed that clean and pure water supply contributes an immense benefit to health status of an individual. The finding implies that infrastructures such as maternity centre, hospitals, and schools should be provided and be made accessible and functional to rural women.

However access to un tarred road accounted for 59.8% and tarred road 38.5% and in the same vain storage facilities accounted for 48.7%. The implication of this low access to motor able road will have negative impact on their productivity. This in line with Ogolo (1995) who observed that due to lack of infrastructural facilities in the Nigeria rural areas agricultural output has continued to lag behind population growth while rural poverty continues unabated. Similarly, Udu and Agu (1989) stated that in Nigeria motor able roads and good storage facilities are responsible for about third of post- harvest losses of the nation's food output. This implies that rural women cannot easily transport their farm produce to urban markets.

Table 4 revealed that distribution of respondents according to extent of access to rural infrastructure. The findings revealed that access to women group with a mean score of 1.33 and ranked 1st, closely followed by cooperative society with mean score of 1.23 and ranked 2nd and access to telecommunication with mean score of 0.98 and ranked 3rd. Access to market facilities with mean score of 0.91 and ranked 4th.This implies that social groups can serve as a means of capacity building on poverty reduction for rural women.

However, poor access to infrastructural facilities in the rural area has impacted negatively on rural development. The primitive state of rural roads constitutes the most single factor underlying the underdevelopment of rural area. In this regard Nwafor and Madu (2002) had stated that there is a direct relationship between the building of roads and market facilities and agricultural production in less developed countries.

Table 5 shows that there is no significant relationship between some selected socio – economic characteristics of rural women and their access to infrastructural facilities. Table 5 shows the r – value of positive Age r = (0.174), P < 0.10 and years of resident r – 0.217; P < 0.05. However, the relationship was not significant in variables such as marital status, r = -0.02 and household size r = 0.026 P > 0.05.This translates to the fact that as respondents age increase there is tendency for them to have high access to infrastructural facilities. Also for every unit increase there is tendency for accessibility to infrastructural facilities.

4.Conclusion and Recommendation

It can be concluded from the findings of the study that majority of the rural women in the study area are middle age, married with 5- 7 children and had one form of education or

the other. The study confirmed that rural women have little access to infrastructural facilities and this will affect their productivity negatively.

The following recommendations were suggested;

There is need for provision of basic infrastructure and amenities such as good roads, rural electrification, health and education facilities that will lead to increased rural productivity.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age(years)		
20 – 29	14	11.9
30 – 30	19	16.2
40 – 49	63	53.8
50 – 59	12	10.3
60 and above	9	7.7
Marital Status		
Single	15	12.8
Married	81	69.2
Widow	10	8.6
Divorced	11	9.3
Family Size		
1 – 4	40	34.2
5 – 8	42	61.5
9 and above	5	4.3
Educational level (years)		
0	19	16.2
1 – 6	54	46.1
7 – 9	30	25.6
10 and above	14	11.9
Social Participation		
Member of organization	85	72.6
Not a member	32	27.4
Years of residence		
Less than 20	70	67.5
21 – 39	25	21.4
40 – 59	7	6.0
60 and above	6	5.1

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to socio economic characteristics

(n = 117)

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Activities	Frequency	percentage
Food crop production	114	96.6
Livestock rearing	94	80.3
Trading	99	84.6
Tailoring and Crop production	40	34.2
Hair dressing	60	51.3
Gathering of Non timber		
Forest product	50	42.7
Laundry Services	33	28.2
Crop processing and marketing	88	75.2
Crop production and processing	69	59.0
Livestock production and marketing	73	62.4

Table 2: Distribution of respondents by income generating activities (n = 117)
Source: Field Survey, 2010.
* Multiple Responses

Rural infrastructure	Frequency	percentage
a. Physical		
Tarred Road	45	38.5
Untarred road	70	59.8
Adequate Storage Facilities	57	48.7
Adequate processing facilities	65	55.5
b. Social		
Hospitals	39	33.3
Dispensaries	48	41.0
Maternity	54	46.2
Primary Schools	75	64.1
Secondary Schools	67	57.3
Vocational Schools	39	33.3
Water Supply	57	48.7
Communication	85	72.6
c. Rural		
Cooperative Societies	99	74.6
Women's group	102	87.1
Bank	36	32.7
Post Offices	22	20
Electricity	58	49.5
Market facilities	89	76.1

Table 3: Distribution of respondents by access to rural infrastructure
Source: Field Survey, 2010.
* Multiple Responses

Rural infrastructure	Frequency	percentage
a. Physical		
Tarred Road	0.53	13th
Untarred road	0.79	6th
Adequate Storage Facilities	0.61	9th
Adequate processing facilities	0.81	5th
b. Social		
Hospitals	0.41	14th
Dispensaries	0.54	12th
Maternity	0.58	11th
Primary Schools	0.68	7th
Secondary Schools	0.64	8th
Vocational Schools	0.36	15th
Water Supply	0.61	9th
Communication	0.98	3rd
c. Rural		
Cooperative Societies	1.23	2nd
Women's group	1.33	1st
Bank	0.37	16th
Post Offices	0.33	17th
Electricity	0.25	18th
Market facilities	0.91	4th

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by extent of access to infrastructure
Source: Field Survey, 2010.
* Multiple Responses

Variables	P – value	r – Value	Remark
Age	0.060	0.174**	S
Marital Status	0.834	0.020	NS
Household size	0.784	0.026	NS
Years of residence	0.019	0.217*	S

Table 5: Summary of Pearson Correlation analysis showing relationship between

selected socio – economic characteristics of rural women and access to infrastructural

facilities

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

** Significant at 10%

* Significant at 5%

NS - Not significant

S - Significant

5.Reference

1. Adebayo, O. O. (2010): Effect of livelihood activities and Empowerment of Rural women on   household food security in Oyo state, Nigeria. An unpublished Ph.D Thesis in the   Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, LAUTECH, Ogbomoso.

2. Fakayode,B.S, O.A Omotheso, A.B Isoho and P.D Ajayi (2000): An Economics Survey   Infrastrutures and Agricultural Productivity profile in Nigeria.European Journal of   Social Science vol 7 no2, pp 158-170

3. Food and Agricultural Organization (2005): Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development   Programme.FAO Coprate Document   Reprository. Accessed at www.fao.org on 10th Nov 2006

4. Mafimisebi, (2002) Rural Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria, In Okunmadewa F.(2002) (Ed) Poverty Reduction and the Nigeria Agricultural Sector, Elshaddai Global   Ventures Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria.

5. Nwafor, J. L. and Madu I. A. (2002): Issues in Population and Rural Development, Fulladu   Publishing Company, Enugu, Nigeria.

6. Ogolo, M. B (1995): Grassroots participation in Rural Development in Anambra state. Ph.D   Dissertation submitted to the University of Ibadan.

7. Udu, C. and Agu, G. A. (1989): New System Economics African Feb – Publishers Ltd, Lagos, Nigeria Pp 212 – 238.

8. World Bank (2001) World Development Report. Attacking Poverty, New York: Oxford   University Press