

IMPACT OF RURAL FINANCE INSTITUTION BUILDING PROGRAMME (RUFIN) ON ARABLE CROP FARMERS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Akeremale, A.O., Akinagbe, O.M and Odefadehan, O.O

Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication Technology,
Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria
Corresponding Email: kemiesther4real@yahoo.com

Abstract

In an attempt to reduce poverty and improve agricultural productivity among small-scale farmers in Nigeria, the Federal Government of Nigeria and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have jointly funded the Rural Finance Institution Building Programme (RUFIN) between 2010 and 2017. This is because small scale arable crop farmers constitute an important component of the agricultural sector in Nigeria. This study was conducted to assess the impact of RUFIN programme on financial support of the beneficiaries as well as their income. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to sample 150 beneficiaries and 150 non-beneficiaries with the use of structured interview schedule. Data collected were analysed with frequency counts, percentages and mean while paired t-test was used to test the differences between beneficiaries' income before and after RUFIN programme at 0.05 level of significance. Results showed that the mean ages of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were approximately 49 and 48 years, respectively. Majority (92.0% and 78.8%) of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries married. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had an average household size of 6 persons respectively. However, the study further revealed the accessibility to financial support of RUFIN programme was always accessible on the average of ₦107,133.00 amount of loan granted to the beneficiaries. The average number of hectares cultivated by the beneficiaries increased from 2.66 to 4.60 while there was only an increment of 2.45 to 3.73 for the non-beneficiaries. For the three arable crops investigated (maize, cassava and yam), the yield increased from 231.09 tons in 2010 to 343.08 tons in 2017 for the beneficiaries while there was a slight decrease in the yield of the non-beneficiaries from 241.36 tons to 237.09 tons within the same year frame. Results of paired t-test showed that significant differences exist in the income of the beneficiaries with a t-value of 6.17; $p \leq 0.05$. The findings concluded that RUFIN has produced a positive impact in the lives of the beneficiaries. It is recommended that programme of this nature should be extended by the sponsored bodies for more empowerment and reduction in the poverty status of arable crop farmers.

Keywords: Arable, Crops, Farmers, Financial support, Effects and RUFIN.

Introduction

Agricultural development is the foundation for economic growth and provides a primary means of food security, employment generation and poverty reduction for Nigerians (Onumadu and Inyang 2015). The majority of the poor people in Nigeria live in the rural areas and a significant proportion of them are small-scale farmers (Olatomide and Omowumi, 2016). The issues of poverty among rural households in Nigeria as

well as rising food insecurity and high rates of unemployment present the need to promote measures that will ensure economic growth that will benefit the poor and ensure income generation. Poverty in Nigeria is concentrated mostly in rural areas which accommodate more than 70% of the nations poor (World Bank, 2017). The majority of the poor in sub-Saharan Africa relies on agricultural production for a livelihood and hence that sector is fundamental to spurring

growth, enhancing food security, alleviating poverty and generating income. To be able to continue with the production of agricultural products to match up with the world's increasing population, it is inherent that these small-scale farmers move from the traditional method of farming to a more developed and improved technological way of farming (Fadeyi, 2016).

Agricultural tools in Nigeria have become outdated over the years and productivity has been decreased as a result of the limited use and application of modern technology in the sector, the cost of embracing modern agricultural tools has proven too expensive for the average Nigerian farmer and hence each successive government has initiated and implemented agricultural policies and programmes in an attempt to stimulate sustainable agricultural growth and development (Akpaeti 2015).

Rural Finance Institution Building Programme (RUFIN) was initiated in the year 2006 and became effective in 2010. The programme is a Loan Agreement of US\$27.2 million between the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Federal Government of Nigeria. The programme is a strategic means by which the rural micro finance sector is developed and strengthened in order to deliver adequate, efficient and sustainable financial services to the rural farmers. The central objective of the programme is to develop and strengthen Micro Finance Banks (MFBs), other member-based Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs), by enhancing the access of the rural populace to the services of these institutions in order to expand and improve agricultural productivity and Micro-Small Rural Enterprises. RUFIN is currently operational in 12 states in Nigeria with 3 LGA from each of the states participating (altogether, 36 LGAs in Nigeria are involved). Participating states are Adamawa and Bauchi (North-East), Katsina and Zamfara (North-West), Benue and Nasarawa (North-Central), Lagos and Oyo (South-West), Anambra and Imo (South-East) and Akwa-Ibom and Edo (South-South). (NIPC, 2015; RUFIN, 2011). In Nigeria, like most other countries in the

African continent is not only endowed with vast agricultural farmland, but also conducive geographical condition that favours agricultural production throughout the year. Despite this great potential, there is not much to show for it. (Salami and Arawomo, 2016). Access to affordable and timely financial services has been a major limiting factor to economic development in Nigeria particularly to members of the rural community. In view of these, the following research questions were addressed; what are the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents in the study area?, how accessible is financial support of RUFIN programme?, what are the effects of RUFIN programme on farmers' income in the study area?

Objective of the Study

The general objective of the study was to examine the impact of Rural Finance Institution Building Programme (RUFIN) on Arable crop farmers in Oyo States, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to:

- i. ascertain the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents in the study area;
- ii. determine the accessibility to financial support of RUFIN programme;
- iii. determine the effects of RUFIN programme on farmers income.

Methodology

A multistage sampling procedure was used in the selection of respondents for the study.

The first stage involved purposive selection of all the three (3) Local Government Areas (LGAs) Akinyele, Atisbo and Ibarapa east out of the thirty-three local government areas (LGAs) in Oyo State. The second stage involved random selection of five (5) communities / villages where the RUFIN programme had been implemented in each LGAs and where farmers benefitted from the programme. The third stage involved random selection of ten (10) registered farmers each from the Village Savings and Credit Groups (VSCGs) per LGAs. This implies that fifty (50) farmers which are beneficiaries will be selected from each LGAs making a one hundred and fifty respondents. Also, from each of the villages

where the beneficiaries came from, one hundred and fifty (150) farmers who are not beneficiaries were as well randomly selected making a total of three hundred (300) respondents respectively. This served as a comparison group. Hence, a total of three hundred (300) respondents constituted the sample size for the study. The study used primary data. The primary data was obtained with the aid of test-retest and validated interview schedule. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, means and inferential statistics such as t-test analysis was carried out.

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1 revealed the age distribution of the respondents. About 41% of the beneficiaries were within the age of 41-50 years, 22.0% were within the age of 51-60, 17.0% of the respondents were 61 years and above, while 12.0% were within the age group of 31-40. The average age of the beneficiaries was 49.3 years. This implies that most of the beneficiaries were in their active and productive age. Furthermore, Table 1 revealed that about 52% of the non-beneficiaries were between the ages of 41 and 50 years, 19.3% were between 31 and 40 years. 15.3% were between the age of 51-60 years while 61 years and above accounted for 11.3%. The average age of the non-beneficiaries was 47.5 years. This implies that the non-beneficiaries were also in their productive age. Majority (61.3%) of the beneficiaries were female while 38.7% were male. This could imply that females are more into group activities than male. This is in agreement with the programme provision of reaching out to an estimated population of 345,000 families, of which 138,000 (40%) at least, will be women-headed households (NIPC, 2015). Similarly, majority (71.3%) of non-beneficiaries were female while 28.7% were male. This could imply that female are more into group activities than male; may be, as a result of inadequate access to productive resources. This is the support the findings of Mucavele (2015), that 80% of agricultural production comes from small scale farmers, who are mostly rural women that do not have access and control over all land and

productive resources but most times utilize the power of group to achieve their aims.

Result indicated that greater proportion (92.0%) of the beneficiaries were married, widows constitute 6.7% while 1.3% were single. This implies that the programme was more appreciated by people with family responsibilities while, greater percentage (85.3%) of non-beneficiaries were married while 11.3% and 2.7% were widowed and single, respectively. Findings show most (53.3%) of the beneficiaries had household size between 6 and 10 persons, 43.3% of the beneficiaries had household size of less than 5 persons and 2.7% had household size of greater than 11 persons. The mean household size was 6 persons. Table 1 as well revealed that about 65% of the non-beneficiaries have a household size between 6 and 10 persons, 30.0% had household size of less than 5 persons, while, 4.7% had household of 11-15 persons. On the average, household size for non-beneficiaries was the same (6 persons) with that of beneficiaries. The findings suggest that large family size is common among the people, which may be connected to their labour demanding farm activities. This is in line with Zainab and Kehinde (2019) who reported that household size is possibly a plus for family labour use in farmlands. Table 1 further reveals that 31.3% of the beneficiaries attempted primary education. About 25% completed primary education, 21.3% completed secondary school. Participants who attempted secondary education and those with adult education had equal proportion (7.3%). Beneficiaries who completed tertiary education only accounted for 4.7% while 3.3% had no formal education. This brought to view that the majority of RUFIN beneficiaries were literate to some extent; with primary school leaving certificate as their highest qualifications; and as such could boost farmers abilities in utilizing RUFIN information. This result is in support of the findings of Mallam, M., Agbo, F. U. And Ebe, F. E. (2014) who found that education exposes the farmers to new knowledge about new farming technologies. The more educated a farmer the less inefficient they become as education is one of the socio-economic variables that greatly affects farmers decision to accept and

adopt modern farming technologies. On the other hand, greater proportion (23.3%) of non-beneficiaries attempted secondary education, 20.0% completed secondary education, 17.3% completed primary education, 13.3% had no formal education. Participants who attempted primary education and those with adult education had equal proportion (9.3%) and the remaining 4.0% completed tertiary education, only 3.3% attempted tertiary education. This implies that majority of non-beneficiaries had secondary school leaving certificate, and as such could appreciate the programme when extended to them. Furthermore, Table 1 reveals that 37.3% of the beneficiaries had farm size of 3.1-5.0 hectares, 26.0% had farm size of 1.1-3.0 hectares while greater than 7.0 hectares had farm size 12.0%. On the other hand, greater proportion (28.0%) of non-beneficiaries had farm size of less than 1 and 1.0-3.0 hectares respectively while 16% had farm size of greater than 7.1 hectares. The average farm size cultivated by the beneficiaries was 4.18 hectares while non-beneficiaries was 3.17 revealing an increase by 1.1 hectares. The average farm size of beneficiaries was higher than non-beneficiaries by 1.1 hectares. This implies that the average farm size of the beneficiaries was higher than of non-beneficiaries. This suggests that benefiting from the RUFIN led to the cultivation of larger hectares of land by the beneficiaries. This may be because access to loan were given to them which enabled them to increase the hectares of land cultivated. Result in Table 1 shows that most (94.7%) of the beneficiaries belong to social group while about 97.0% of the non-beneficiaries also belong to social group. This could be as a result of the importance attached to socio groupings and the benefits they have being receiving/gaining through it. This agrees with Oladele and Wakatsuki (2012) established that adopting a new technology would be influenced by other farmers in their social group where they share information and learn from each other.

Sources of Information on RUFIN Programme

Result in Table 2 reveals that the majority (79.3%) of the beneficiaries got information on RUFIN activities through their fellow farmers. About 78.0% sourced information from ADP/Ministry of Agriculture. Farmers cooperatives accounted for 58.7% while 46.0% sourced via friends/Neighbour, close to that were radio with 40.7% while 39.3% sourced from television. Newspaper and Internet accounted for 6.0% and 4.7%, respectively. This reveals that interpersonal channels of communication were deployed more by the beneficiaries in sourcing agricultural information. This corroborates with the findings of Okwu and Daudu (2011) who found out that interpersonal channel has higher relative usage by farmers than mass media. The Table also shows that 38.7% of the non-beneficiaries sourced agriculture related information from ADP/Extension agents, fellow farmers accounted for 14.0% newspaper and internet were not utilized.

Financial Support of RUFIN Programme

Table 3 shows that respondents view on the financial support of RUFIN programme. The result shows that majority (64.0%) of the beneficiaries asserted that obtaining application form was always accessible, while 70.7% of the respondents asserted that the period of processing the form was always accessible. Also, 86.0% of the respondents noted that submission of forms was always accessible. In the same vein, greater proportion 72.7% and 76.0% of the beneficiaries asserted that follow up of processed form and receiving money disbursed was always accessible respectively. The implication of this is that, accessibility to financial support to the beneficiaries are always accessible. This could be as a result of proper planning that back-up the programme. On the other hand, only completion of customers document (80.0%) was never accessible. This was due to the RUFIN services embedded in the programme which needs to be official to the beneficiaries.

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

Beneficiaries (n=150)	Non-Beneficiaries (n=150)
-----------------------	---------------------------

	Frequency	%	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Frequency	%	Mean ($\bar{X}$)
Age (years)						
<30	11	7.3	49.3	2	1.3	47.5
31-40	18	12.0		29	19.3	
41-50	62	41.3		79	52.7	
51-60	33	22.0		23	15.3	
>60	26	17.3		17	11.3	
Sex						
Male	58	38.7		43	28.7	
Female	92	61.3		107	71.3	
Marital Status						
Single	2	1.3		4	2.7	
Married	138	92.0		128	85.3	
Widowed	10	6.7		17	11.3	
Separated				1	0.7	
Household Size (number)						
1-5	65	43.3	6	45	30.0	6
6-10	80	53.3		98	65.3	
11-15	4	2.7		7	4.7	
>15	1	0.7				
Level of Education						
No formal Education	5	3.3		20	13.3	
Adult education	11	7.3		14	9.3	
Attempted Primary school	47	31.3		14	9.3	
Completed Primary school	37	24.7		26	17.3	
Attempted Secondary school	11	7.3		35	23.3	
Completed secondary school	32	21.3		30	20.0	
Attempted Tertiary School	0	0.0		5	3.3	
Completed Tertiary School	7	4.7		6	4.0	
Farm size (hectares)						
<1.0	21	14.0	4.18	42	28.0	3.17
1.1-3.0	39	26.0		42	28.0	
3.1-5.0	56	37.3		26	17.3	
5.1-7.0	16	10.7		16	10.7	
>7.1	18	12.0		24	16.0	
Membership of social group						
Yes	142	94.7		146	97.3	
No	8	5.3		4	2.7	

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 2: Sources of Information on RUFIN Programme

	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sources of information				
Radio	66	40.7	3	2.0
Television	59	39.3	2	1.3
Friends/Neighbour	69	46.0	1	0.7
ADP/Extension agents	118	78.7	58	38.7
Farmers cooperative	88	58.7	9	6.0
Fellow farmers	119	79.3	21	14.0
Newspaper	9	6.0	0	0.0
Internet	7	4.7	0	0.0

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents according to Accessibility to Financial Support of RUFIN Programme

Variable	Always Accessible	Sometimes Accessible	Never Accessible
Obtaining form	96(64.0)	54(36.0)	0.00
Processing of forms	106(70.7)	44(29.3)	0.00
Submission of forms	129(86.0)	21 (14.0)	0.00
Completion of customers document	0.00	30(20.0)	120(80.0)
Follow up of processed form	109(72.7)	29(19.3)	12(8.0)
Receiving money disbursed	114(76.0)	36(24.0)	0.00

Source: Field survey, 2021

Loan Statistics

Amount of loan applied, approved and received.

Table 3 shows that greater proportion (66.7%) of the beneficiaries applied and obtained loan that ranged from ₦50,001 - ₦100,000. About 23% applied and obtained loan that ranged between ₦100,001 – ₦150,000, while 10.0% applied and obtained more than ₦150,001. The average amount of loan applied and obtained by RUFIN beneficiaries was ₦107,133. The reason why they had equal amount of loan applied, approved and received was that, RUFIN provides substantial and standardizes training to avoid multiple quality to the beneficiaries by embraces effective targeting of training curriculum to reflect target priorities and needs. This really help them to know the exact amount to be applied for.

Duration from application to disbursement

Table 4 shows that the greater percentage (81.3%) of beneficiaries got loan in less than 3 months, 11.3% got loan from 4-6 months while 6.7% got loan greater than 12months. The reason for long disbursement could be attributed to the difficulty experienced by the groups which the respondents belonged to.

Length of loan payback

Result in Table 4 shows greater proportion (48.7%) of the beneficiaries had 9 – 12months as length of loan payback period. About 39% had 5 – 8months. Only 8% had 1 -4 months and 4.7% had greater than 12months. On the average, beneficiaries were given 10 months to pay back loans. This implies that the loan was not utilized for ventures that couldn't turnover within a year.

This is in consonance with the findings of Ayanda and Ogunsekan (2012) who stated that Bank of Agriculture, in their mandate, stipulates 7 - 12months for loans repayment to be completed.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to Loan Statistics

	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean (M)
How much did you apply for (₦)			
50,001-100,000	100	66.7	
100,001-150,000	35	23.3	₦ 107,133
>150,001	15	10.0	
How much was approved (₦)			
50,001-100,000	100	66.7	
100,001-150,000	35	23.3	₦107,133
>150,001	15	10.0	
How much did you receive (₦)			
50,001-100,000	100	66.7	
100,001-150,000	35	23.3	₦107,133
>150,001	15	10.0	
How long did it take from application to disbursement?			
<3 months	122	81.3	
4-6months	17	11.3	
7-9months	1	0.7	
>12months	10	6.7	
Length of loan payback			
1-4months	12	8.0	
5-8months	58	38.7	9.62
9-12months	73	48.7	
>12months	7	4.7	
Interest rate			
1-5	134	89.3	
6-10	9	6.0	4.86
>11	7	4.7	
Purpose of the loan			
To invest/finance on my farm business		100.0	

Source: Field survey, 2021

Loan Interest rate

Result in Table 4 shows that majority (89.3%) of the beneficiaries have interest rate between 1-5% from RUFIN programme. About 6% have interest rate between 6-10% while 4.7% have interest rate greater than 11%. However, the mean value of the loan interest rate was 5%. This implies that the interest rate of the programme is relatively low.

Effect of RUFIN Programme on Farmers' Income for Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

Quantity of maize produced by respondent

As shown in Table 5, the average quantity of maize produced by participating farmers before the RUFIN programme in 2010 was 1.20 tonnes, after the programme in 2017, the quantity of maize produced was 2.11 tonnes, indicating a percentage increase of 0.91%. For non-participating farmers, the average quantity of

maize produced in 2010 was 1.29 tonnes while in 2017, the average quantity of maize produced was 1.49 tonnes, indicating a percentage increase of 0.20%. This implies that, the percentage increase in quantity of maize produced by participating farmers (0.91%) was higher than the percentage increase in quantity of maize produced by non-participating farmers (0.20%). This therefore showed that the RUFIN programme had effect in quantity of maize produced. This could have been as a result of the financial assistance and training the participating farmers received by the officials.

Quantity of cassava produced by respondents

Data in Table 5 further revealed that the average of cassava produced by participating farmers before the programme in 2010 was 1.22 tonnes, after the programme in 2017, the average quantity of cassava produced was 1.95 tonnes, indicating a percentage increase of 0.73%. The implication of this is that, there is a percentage increase in the quantity of cassava produced by the participating farmers (0.73%). For non-participating farmers, the average quantity of cassava produced in 2010 was 1.07 tonnes, while, in 2017, the average quantity of cassava produced was 1.27 tonnes, indicating a percentage increase of 0.20%. The implication of this is that, there is a percentage increase in the quantity of cassava produced by the non-participating farmers (0.20%). The percentage increase for beneficiaries (0.73%) is higher than percentage increase (0.20%) for non-beneficiaries. This shows that the programme had effect in the quantity of cassava produced and this could be as a result of more favourable weather condition not neglecting their farmers' access to loan and technical advices

Quantity of yam produced by respondents

Entries in Table 5 revealed that the average of yam produced by participating farmers before the programme in 2010 was 228.67Kg, after the programme in 2017, the average quantity of yam produced was 340.00Kg, indicating a percentage increase of 111.34Kg. For the non-participating farmers, the average quantity of yam produced in 2010 was 232.00Kg, while, in 2017, the average

quantity of yam produced was 279.00Kg, indicating a percentage increase of 47Kg. The implication of this was that, the percentage increase in the quantity of yam produced by the participating farmers (111.34%) was higher than the percentage increase in the quantity of yam produced by non-participating farmers (47Kg). The positive changes recorded for the participants in Table 4 could be as a result of contact most of them had with RUFIN officials on training related on finance issue and timely access to loan and therefore influence their production and income.

Income Realised before and after RUFIN Programme for Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

Results in Table 6 revealed that the average income by beneficiaries' farmers before the programme in 2010 was ₦139,464.00k, after the programme in 2017, the average income was ₦399,793.33k indicating an increase of ₦260,329.33k. For the non-beneficiaries farmers, the average income in 2010 was ₦140,400.67k, while in 2017, the average income was ₦363,846.67, indicating an increase of ₦223,446.00k. The implication of this was that, the increase in income by the beneficiaries farmers (₦260,329.33k.) was higher than the increase in income by non-beneficiaries farmers (₦223,446.00k). This implies that the programme had effect on the income of the beneficiaries and this could be as a result of the access to financial support, agricultural inputs and access to extension services. This influence their production and therefore, increase their income and as well improved their standard of living.

Difference in income of beneficiaries' farmers before and after the RUFIN programme

Entries in Table 7 revealed the result of t-test for the difference between the quantity produced before and after participating in RUFIN programme. The result showed that there was a significant difference in quantity of maize produced before and after participating in the programme ($t=-13.640$; $p\leq 0.05$), quantity of cassava produced before and after participating in the programme ($t= 11.418$, $p\leq 0.05$) and, quantity

of yam produced before and after participating in the programme ($t= 8.577$, $p \leq 0.05$). Furthermore, Table 11 revealed that there was a significant 16.051, $p \leq 0.05$) and the amount realised on the quantity of cassava produced ($t= 19.793$, $p \leq 0.05$) and the amount realised on the quantity of yam produced ($t= 21.795$, $p \leq 0.05$). This implies that the quantity produced and the amount realised for beneficiaries was higher than the percentage increase for non-beneficiaries. This could be due to timely access to financial support, advisory services and, other agricultural inputs. Therefore, this led to the higher profit made by the beneficiaries' farmers.

Difference in income of non-beneficiaries' farmers before and after the programme

Entries in Table 8 revealed the result of t-test for the difference between the quantity produced increase for beneficiaries

difference in the amount realized on the quantity of maize produced ($t=$

before and after. The result showed that there was a significant difference in the quantity of maize produced before and after ($t=3.288$, $p \leq 0.05$), quantity of cassava produced before and after ($t= 2.131$, $p \leq 0.05$) and quantity of yam produced before and after ($t= 3.980$, $p \leq 0.05$). Table 11 revealed that there was a significant difference in the amount realized on the quantity of maize produced ($t= 12.109$, $p \leq 0.05$), the amount realized on the quantity of cassava produced ($t= 5.405$, $p \leq 0.05$) and the amount realized on the quantity of yam produced ($t= 19.633$, $p \leq 0.05$). This implies that the quantity produced and the amount realized for non-beneficiaries was lower than the percentage

Table 5: Quantity produced before and after RUFIN Programme for beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

	Beneficiaries				Non-beneficiaries			
	Before RUFIN programme (2010) Percentage (%)	Mean	After RUFIN programme (2017) Percentage (%)	Mean	Before RUFIN programme (2010) Percentage (%)	Mean	After RUFIN programme (2017) Percentage (%)	Mean
Quantity of maize produced (Tons)								
< 1.0	60.0		36.0		48.0		40.7	
1.1-2.0	33.3	1.20	45.3	2.11	46.6	1.29	42.6	1.49
>2.1	6.7		18.7		5.3		16.7	
Quantity of cassava produced (Tons)								
< 1.0	57.3		32.0		41.4		54.7	
1.1-2.0	34.7	1.22	52.0	1.95	49.4	1.07	30.6	1.27
>2.1	8.0		16.0		9.3		14.7	
Quantity of yam produced (Tubers)								
<200	53.3		21.3		48.0		35.3	
201-400	40.0	228.67	49.3	340.00	47.3	239.00	53.4	234.33
>401	6.7		29.3		4.7		11.4	

Source: Field survey 2021

Table 6: Income Realised before and after RUFIN Programme for Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

	Average income before 2010 (Naira)	Average income after 2017 (Naira)	Difference in Income (Naira)
Beneficiaries farmers	139,464.00	399,793.33	260,329.33
Non-beneficiaries farmers	140,400.67	363,846.67	223,446.00

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 7: Difference in Quantity Produced and Income by Beneficiaries' Farmers before and after the RUFIN Programme

	Mean before	Mean after	t value	df	Sig
Quantity of maize produced	1.2000	2.11	13.640	149	0.000*
Quantity of cassava produced	1.2227	1.9513	11.418	149	0.000*
Quantity of yam produced	228.6667	340.000	8.577	149	0.000*
Amount realized on maize	82060.00	265426.7	16.051	149	0.000*
Amount realized on cassava	18724.00	49893.33	19.793	149	0.000*
Amount realized on yam	28933.33	88193.33	21.795	149	0.000*

Source: Field survey, 2021

(Confidence level: 95%)

Table 8: Difference in Quantity Produced and Income of Non-beneficiaries' Farmers before and after the Programme

	Mean for non-beneficiaries farmers	Mean for non-beneficiaries farmers	t value	df	Sig
Quantity of maize produced	1.2933	1.4900	3.288	149	0.000*
Quantity of cassava produced	1.2480	1.3867	2.131	149	0.035*
Quantity of yam produced	232.333	279.000	3.980	149	0.000*
Amount realized on maize	92126.67	232760.00	12.109	149	0.000*
Amount realized on cassava	31217.33	27430.67	5.405	149	0.001*
Amount realized on yam	31333.33	83406.67	19.633	149	0.000*

Source: Field survey, 2021

(Confidence level: 95%)

Conclusion

The study revealed the impact of Rural Finance Institution Building Programme (RUFIN) on Arable crop farmers in Oyo States, Nigeria. Greater percentage of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries farmers were in their active and productive age and married respondents dominate the study area. Also, this brought to view that majority of respondents were literate to some extent. However, majority of the respondents belong to social organization. The study shows that financial support is an important tool for improving the welfare of the poor and also enhances the production capacity of the poor rural farmers. The study further reveals that RUFIN had a positive effect on the quantity of maize, cassava and yam produced for beneficiaries than non-beneficiaries as a result of the implementation of Rural Finance

Institution Building Programme. Despite the positive results recorded, much may still be achieved if the government, donor agencies, private sectors, non-governmental organizations, policy makers and researchers were able to address the challenges hindering the development of agriculture and eradication of poverty in Nigeria.

References

- Akpaeti, A.J. (2015). Impact of financial sector reforms on agricultural growth in Nigeria: A vector autoregressive (Var) approach, *American Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 7, (1)17-35.
- Ayanda, I. F. and Ogunsekan, O. (2012). Farmers' perception of repayment of loans obtained from Bank of Agriculture, Ogun State, Nigeria.

- Journal of Agricultural Science, 3(1), 21-27.
- Fadeyi O.A. (2016). Smallholder Agricultural Finance in Nigeria: Literature Review on The Research Gap. *International Journal of New Technology and Research* 4(8).
- Mallam, M., Agbo, F. U. And Ebe, F. E. (2014). Resource Use Efficiency among Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries of Fadama Rice Project in Niger State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Research* 9 (6): 294-303.
- Mucavele, S. (2015). The role of the rural women in Agriculture. In MuGeDe-Wowen, Gender and Development Republic of Mozambique-Southern Africa. <http://www.wfo-oma.com/women-inagriculture/article/the-role-of-rural-women-in-agriculture.html>.
- Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) (2015). RUFIN: Rural Finance Institutions. Quotech Global Services.
- Oladele, O.I., Wakatsuki, T., 2012, Socioeconomic Features, Dynamics of farmers Associations and Adoption of Sawah Rice production Technology in Nigeria and Ghana. *Journal of Food Agriculture and Environment* 10(2):434- 437.
- Olatomide, W. O., & Omowumi, A. O. (2016). 'Policy interventions and public expenditure reform for pro-poor agriculture development in Nigeria', *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 9 (4) 487 – 500.
- Onumadu, F. N., & Inyang, N. U. (2018). 'Analysis of the effect of integrated farmers scheme project on beneficiaries' income in Akwa Ibom state Nigeria,' *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 4 (3) 2277 – 8616.
- Salami, A., & Arawomo, D. F. (2016). An empirical analysis of agricultural credit in Africa: Any role for institutional factors? Tunis, Tunisia, Africa Development's Work Paper, Series 192.
- World Bank (2017). The 2016 multidimensional poverty Index was launched last week. What does it say? Retrieved from <http://blogs.worldbank.org/publicsphere/2016-multidimensionalpoverty-index-was-launched-last-week-what-does-it-say>.
- Zainab, O. and Kehinde, O.O. (2019). Determinants of Food Security and Technical Efficiency among Agricultural Households in Nigeria. Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, Chatham Maritime, Kent ME4 4TB, UK. Published: 10th October, 2019.