



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

Article

Accepted Version

Silong, A. and Gadanakis, Y. (2019) Credit sources, access and factors influencing credit demand among rural livestock farmers in Nigeria. *Agricultural Finance Review*. ISSN 0002-1466 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/AFR-10-2018-0090> Available at <http://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](http://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), Emeseffi 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  $i^{\text{th}}$  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  $\varepsilon$  = 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  
45 of access to credit due to a unit change in any of the explanatory factors in the model.  
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  
52 sources identified, the MNL was applied. In this scenario, the decision makers were faced with choices  
53  
54 involving more than two alternatives. If a farmer were to access credit from these three choices; formal,  
55  
56 semi-formal and non-formal credit sources, which one option does he/she choose? In each of these  
57  
58 scenarios, the observed decision is related to a set of explanatory variables. The estimation and  
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  $\beta_{12}$  and  $\beta_{22}$  are specific to the second alternative, and  $\beta_{13}$  and  $\beta_{23}$  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 specifics ( $X_i$ ). 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	%				
<b>Marital status</b>								
Single	13	12%	16	15%				
Married	95	88%	92	85%				
<b>Education</b>								
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%				
<b>Access to extension / veterinary services</b>								
<i>Had access</i>								
	55	51%	40	37%				
<i>Had no access</i>	53	49%	68	63%				
<b>Group membership</b>								
<i>Have no group membership</i>	52	66.7%	72	66.7%				
<i>Have group membership</i>	22	33.3%	36	33.3%				
<b>Access to credit</b>								
<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  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Non-formal credit providers are made up of friends, spouses, relatives, and moneylenders, such as rural  
48 shopkeepers, traders, and merchants. These credit providers play a crucial role in financing the activities  
49 of farmers. Loans given to farmers by non-formal lenders are usually in forms of cash or production  
50 inputs (most often drugs, vaccines and other agro-chemicals from shopkeepers) and are preferable  
51 because of proximity and timeliness of delivery. That notwithstanding, credit from non-formal  
52 providers are short-term and are most often associated with high costs, especially if borrowed from  
53 moneylenders or merchants (Badiru, 2010; Okojie et al., 2010).  
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 <sub>1</sub> (Formal credits institutions)				Y <sub>2</sub> (Semi formal credit institutions)				Y <sub>3</sub> (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 R<sup>2</sup> 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 KIs 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](http://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 Ojo, E. O. and Adebayo, P. F. (2012). Food security in Nigeria: An overview European  
21 Journal of Development. 1,2, 1999 – 222.  
22
- 23 Ogbuabor, J. E., and Nwosu C. A. (2017). The Impact of Deposit Money Bank's Agricultural  
24 Credit on Agricultural Productivity in Nigeria: Evidence from an Error Correction  
25 Model. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 2017, 7(2), 513-517.  
26 available at <http://www.econjournals.com>  
27  
28
- 29 Okojie, C., A., Monye-Emina, K., Eghafona, G., & Osaghae, J.O. (2010). Institutional  
30 environment and access to microfinance by self-employed women in the rural  
31 areas of Edo State. Washington. D.C.: International Food Policy Research  
32 Institute.  
33  
34
- 35 Ololade R.A. and Olagunju F.I. (2013): Determinants of Access to Credit among Rural  
36 Farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Science Frontier Research (D)*  
37 13(2),17-22  
38  
39
- 40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Owualah, S.I. (1999): Entrepreneurship in small business firm G-MAG investment Ltd.  
Ikeja, Lagos. p.67.
- Philip, D., Nkoya, E., Pender, J. & Ono, A. O. (2009). Constraints to increasing Agricultural  
Productivity in Nigeria. In: (NSSP), N. S. S. P. (ed.) *Sustainable Solutions for ending  
Hunger and Poverty.* International Food Policy Research Institute. IFPRI, Supported  
by CGIAR.
- Pindyck, R. S., Rubinfeld, D. L. (1998). *Econometric models and economic forecasts*  
Business & Economics - 634 pages.
- Quisumbing, A. & Pandolfelli, L. (2009). Promising Approaches to address the Needs of  
Poor Female Farmers. Washington, D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute.



- 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