



**SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE UTILIZATION OF
LIVESTOCK EXTENSION SERVICES IN ARAPAI SUB COUNTY,
SOROTI DISTRICT**

HERBERTOLINGA

BU/UG/2010/176

olingaherbert@yahoo.com



**A RESEARCH DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
AGRICULTURE AND ANIMAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
REQUIREMENTS FOR AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ANIMAL
PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY**

MAY, 2013

DECLARATION:

I **Herbert Olinga** hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and has never been submitted to any University for the award of a Degree

Signed  Date 06/09/2013

This thesis has been submitted for examination with the approval of;

Dr. Richard A. Alingu:

BVM, MSc.IAH

Teaching Assistant

Department of Animal Production and Management,

Busitema University

Signed  Date 06/06/2013



DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the entire family of Mr. & Mrs. Joshua Adilo Ongom, fellow friends and the entire class of APM 2010.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My special thanks go to Dr. Justine Ekou, the course coordinator of B.APM for his effort to coordinate the programme smoothly. Likewise, all lecturers/ instructors and supportive staffs of at the faculty of agriculture and animal sciences are highly acknowledged for their incalculable direct and indirect helps during my undergraduate studies.

I gratefully acknowledge Dr. Alingu Richard and Dr. Walusimbi Emmanuel, my scientific advisors, for their endurance and patience to rectify my work and providing me relevant guidance, constructive suggestion and intellectual criticism to shape and build my work at its present level.

My deep acknowledgement and appreciation go to the staff members of Arapai Sub-county namely; the sub-county chief, the NAADS coordinator, and all the CBOs of Arapai sub-county for their innumerable material and moral supports during this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Problem statement.....	2
1.3 General Objective / Aim / Purpose.....	2
1.4 Specific Objectives.....	2
1.5 Research Questions.....	3
1.6 Significance of the study.....	3
1.7 Justification.....	3
CHAPTER TWO.....	5
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1. Extension Services in Uganda.....	5
2.2. Service delivery in the public sector.....	5
2.2.2. Service delivery in the private sector.....	6
2.3. Factors Affecting Utilization of Agricultural extension services.....	7
2.3.1. Sex:.....	7
2.3.2. Age of the household head.....	8
2.3.3. Level of education:.....	8
2.3.4. Level of income:.....	8
2.3.5. Social participation:.....	8
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS AND MATERIALS.....	10
3.0 Research approach:.....	10
3.1 study area.....	10
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS.....	12
4.1 General characteristics of households.....	12

4.1.2 Age distribution	13
4.1.3 Family size of participating households	13
4.1.4 Educational status	14
4.1.5 Sources of household income.....	15
4.1.6 Occupation of the respondents	15
4.1.7 Total annual income	16
4.1.8 Types and breeds of livestock reared	17
4.1.9 Management systems practiced	17
4.2 Level of livestock extension service utilization	19
4.2.2. Frequency of utilization of extension services:.....	20
4.3 Players in livestock extension service delivery.....	22
4.4 Technology adoption.....	23
4.5. Factors that influence extension service utilization.	24
4.5.1 Relationship between distance and utilization of LES:	24
4.5.2 Relationship between household budgets and utilization of LES	25
4.5.3 Relationship between cost of treatment and utilization of LES	26
4.5.4 Relationship between knowledge of the qualification of the LES providers and utilization of LES.....	27
4.5.5 Relationship between qualification of the LES providers and utilization of LES... 28	
4.5.8 Relationship between breed of cattle and utilization of LES.	29
4.5.9 Relationship between gender of household heads and utilization of LES.	30
4.5.10 Relation between age group and utilization of LES	31
4.5.11 Relationship between family size and level of utilization of extension services ..	31
4.5.12. Relation between education level and utilization of LES.....	32
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	33
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	37
6.1 Conclusion:.....	37
6.2 Recommendations:	37
APPENDICES	41
APPENDIX 1: DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Households practicing different management systems for poultry	19
Table 2: utilization of across different age groups.....	31
Table 3: relationship between family size and utilization of livestock extension services	32
Table 4: relationship between level of education and utilization of livestock extension services.....	32

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: gender status of household heads	12
Figure 2: Distribution of respondents according to age group	13
Figure 3: Family size of participating households.....	14
Figure 4: education status of respondents.....	14
Figure 5: Sources of household income.....	15
Figure 6: Occupation of the respondents	16
Figure 7: Total annual income of the respondents.....	16
Figure 8: Type and breed of livestock kept.	17
Figure 9: Management systems for rearing cattle among the respondents.....	18
Figure 10: Management system of shoats.....	18
Figure 11: Reasons for not utilizing livestock extension services.....	20
Figure 12: Frequency of utilization of livestock extension services.....	21
Figure 13: proportion of extension service providers within Arapai Sub County.....	22
Figure 14: technology adoption across the respondents	24
Figure 15: Relationship between distance and utilization of extension services.....	25
Figure 16: Relationship between availability of extension budgets and utilization of extension services.....	26
Figure 17: Relationship between cost of treatment and utilization of extension services.	27
Figure 18: Relationship between knowledge of qualification of extension service provider and utilization of extension services.....	28
Figure 19: Relationship between qualification of extension service providers and utilization of extension services.....	29
Figure 20: Relationship between breed of cattle and utilization of extension services.	30
Figure 21: Relationship between gender of household head and utilization of extension services.....	31

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APM	Animal Production and Management
ARIS	Agricultural Research Information System
CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
CBFs	Community Based Facilitators
CBO	Community Based Organizations
LES	Livestock Extension Services
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries
MPED	Ministry of Planning and Economic Development
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organization
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
PMA	Plan for Modernization of Agriculture
ZARDI	Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute

ABSTRACT

This cross-sectional study was carried out to determine the socio-economic factors influencing the utilization of livestock extension services by livestock producers Arapai sub-county, Soroti district from January to May 2013. A structured questionnaire was administered to 100 participating farmers and data analysed in MS excel (version 2007) and SPSS (version 16.0). Result obtained showed that certificate holders were the most utilized extension service providers (52%) among veterinarians, Para-veterinarians and animal productionists. 59% of the respondents had utilized livestock extension services in the last six months while 41.0% did not. Distance from extension worker ($X^2 = 13.314$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.04$), availability of household budgets for extension services ($X^2 = 24.550$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.000$), cost of treatment ($X^2 = 42.699$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.000$), qualification of extension provider ($X^2 = 19.331$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.000$), gender of household head ($X^2 = 11.513$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.000$), and breed of cattle ($X^2 = 16.892$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.000$) significantly influenced the utilization of livestock extension services. Certificate holders were the most effective livestock extension service providers. The level of utilization of livestock extension services (LES) is low within Arapai sub-county. The influence on utilization of LES is multifactorial and improvements requires a comprehensive approach from all stakeholders. It recommended among others that policies for enhancing the level of utilization livestock extension services in the study area should take into consideration measures to further enhance; the qualification of the extension workers, livestock management systems, level of household budgets for extension services and livestock ownership by women.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The dissemination and application of improved farming technologies and management practices dates back thousands of years, in different parts of the world, including China, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and even in the Americas (Burton and Riikka, 2010). This has been driven by a generally accepted conception that agricultural extension services are essential for agricultural development (Anderson and Feder, 2003) and until recently, provision of these services has largely tended to be in the public sector domain usually under ministries of agriculture. However, a change towards more private sector involvement in the rendering of extension services is being experienced (Rivera, 1991; van den Ban, 2000). This change is attributed to the perceived ineffectiveness, irrelevancy and irresponsiveness of public extension services in addition to budgetary constraints especially in developing countries (Rivera, 1991; Rivera, *et al.*, 2000). In Uganda, these reforms have included privatization of financial support, delivery of extension, and devolution of power to lower levels of governance, together with delegation to NGOs, farmer organizations, and additional grassroots control (Bashaasha *et al.*, 2011). Weak research extension- farmer linkages, use of non-participatory approaches, high levels of bureaucracy and irresponsiveness to farmers' needs are some of the shortcomings noted with the public sector monopolized extension system (NAADS, 2001). Contract privatized arrangement executed by NAADS, a new legal semiautonomous division under the MAAIF and executed within a wider policy framework of a multi-sectorial Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA), decentralization, liberalization, and privatization (Mangheni, 2007) is replacing the gradually phased out public extension system. On the other hand, following privatization, spontaneous private practices proliferated, with vets starting in a small way using personal savings and family loans. By 1998, there were 80 such practices scattered in the high potential areas of the country (Kasirye 1998). Farmers' socio-economic and personal attributes have been severally identified by authors as being instrumental to their Utilization of various technologies (Aslan, *et al* 2007; Hassan, *et al* 2008). However, very little study has been carried out on socio-economic factors that influence the utilization of livestock extension services by farmers in Uganda. Lack of consideration of these socio-economic factors can lead to the design of inefficient policies on extension services resulting in ineffective extension services and low level of dissemination of skills and new appropriate technologies. All these affect the

REFERENCES:

- A.R. Semana (2006) Agricultural Extension Services at Crossroads: present dilemma and possible solutions for future in Uganda. Department of Agricultural Extension/Education Makerere University
- Anderson, J., and Crowder, L.V, (2000). The Present and Future of Public Sector Extension in Africa: Contracting-out or Contracting-in? *Public Administration and Development*
- Chapman, R., & Tripp, R. (2003). Changing incentives for agricultural extension, A review of privatized extension in practice. Overseas development institute (ODI). Agricultural research & extension network (AgREN).
- Aslan S. T. A, K. S., Gundogdu., E. Yaslioglu., M. Kirmikil and I. Arici, (2007). Personal, physical and socioeconomic factors affecting farmers' adoption of land consolidation. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research* 2007 5(2), 204-213
- Bashasha, B., Mangheni, M. N. and Nkonya, E. (2011). Decentralization and rural Service Delivery in Uganda.. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Discussion Paper 01063, February 2011
- Benson, T., and Mugarura, S. (2010). *Livestock Development Planning in Uganda: Identification of Areas of Opportunity and Challenge*. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Chebil, A., Nair, H. and Zaibet L., (2009) Factors affecting farmers willingness to adopt salt tolerant forage crops in South-Eastern Tunisia. *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*.
- Chukwuma Odii Okereke (2012). Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Access And Utilization Of Veterinary Services By Small Ruminant Producers In Izzi Local Government Area Of Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Continental J. Agricultural Economics* 6 (1): 40 - 45, 2012 ISSN: 2141 – 4130
- Crowder, L. V., and J. Anderson. (2002). Uganda: Private sector secondment of government extension agents. In *Contracting for agricultural extension: International case studies and emerging practices*, eds. W. M. Rivera and W. Zijp. Oxford, U.K: CAB Publishing.

Davis, K. (2008). Extension in sub-Saharan Africa: Overview and assessment of past and current models and future prospects. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 15(3), 15-28.

De Munro, P., Salvatici, L., and Conforti, P. (1998). An Overview of Decentralization in Sub-Saharan Africa. Access December 4, 2011

Doss, C.R. and Morris, M. L. (2001). How does gender affect the adoption of agricultural innovations? The case of improved maize technology in Ghana *Agricultural Economics* 25: 27-39

Duaz, J.M.,(2000). Empowering Rural Producer Organizations within the World Bank Initiatives: A Capitalization Study. Uganda as a Country Case Study.

Friis-Hansen, E. and Kisauzi, D..(2004). Uganda: *Evolution of the extension-farmer relationship In Extension reform for rural Development, Vol 2*, eds. W.M. Rivera and g. Alex.

Freund JE, Williams FJ 1983. *Modern Business Statistics*. London: Pitman.

Friis-Hansen, E., and D. Kisauzi. (2004). Uganda: Evolution of the extension-farmer relationship. In *Extension reform for rural development, vol. 2*, eds.

Hassan Ç., C. Yavuz and T. Murat. (2008). Socio-economic factors affecting the level of adoption of innovations in dairy cattle enterprises. *Ankara Üniv Vet Fak Derg*, 55, 183-187, 2008

K. Sathyanarayan, V. Jagadeeswary*, V. Chandrashekhar Murthy, S. Wilfred Ruban and G. Sudha (2010) Socio-economic Status of Livestock farmers of Narasapura Village - A Benchmark Analysis Department of Veterinary & A.H Extension, Veterinary College, KVAFS University, Hebbal, Bangalore

K. Sathyanarayan., V. Jagadeeswary., V. Chandrashekhar., Murthy., S. Wilfred., Ruban and G. Sudha. (2010). Socio-economic Status of Livestock farmers of Narasapura Village - A Benchmark Analysis. *Veterinary World*, Vol.3 No.5 May 2010.

Mogga, N.K. (2001): A description of the primary animal health programme in selected areas of Southern Sudan and Ethiopia and first assessment of programme impact. Freie Universität Berlin and Addis Ababa University, MSc Thesis.

Moira Gundu (2009). The effect of literacy on access to and utilization of agricultural information for household food security at Chirau communal lands in Zimbabwe.

Mwanje, E.E., and Duvel G.H. (1998). Coping with Changes in Agricultural Extension in Uganda and Implications for Program Evaluation: A review of recent Experiences. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension/South Africa*

Mwaura, F., Muwanika, F. R., & Okoboi, G. (2010). Willingness to pay for extension services in Uganda among farmers involved in crop and animal husbandry. In *2010 AAAE Third Conference/AEASA 48th Conference, September 19-23, 2010, Cape Town, South Africa* (No. 96185). African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) & Agricultural Economics Association of South Africa (AEASA).

Nyariki, D. M. (2009). Household Data Collection for Socio-Economic Research in Agriculture: Approaches and Challenges in Developing Countries. *Journal of Social Science, 19*(2), 91-99.

Nahdy, S. (2002). Decentralization of Services in Uganda: The Formation of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS). Kampala: Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute.

Nygaard, D., Paarlberg, R. Sanyu-Mpagi, J. Matovu. R., and Babu, S. (1997). The Modernization of Agriculture in Uganda: The Political Challenge of Moving from Adjustment to Investment. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Quisumbing, A.R. and Pandolfelli, L., (2009) Promising approaches to address the needs of poor female farmers: resources, constraints and interventions *World Development 38: (4) 581-592*

Richard Isabirye (2001). Private Livestock Health Service: Providers and Privatization

Ruhangawebare Godfrey Kalemera (2010). Factors affecting the level of commercialization among cattle keepers in the pastoral areas of Uganda

Thormeyer, T., (1989). Socio-economic Criteria for the Assessment of Smallholder Agricultural Schemes in South African Homelands. University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg