J Hum Ecol, 34(2): 91-100 (2011)
PRINT: ISSN 0970-9274 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6608 DOI: 10.31901/24566608.2011/34.02.04

Livelihood in University of Ibadan Social Laboratory in Ileogbo Community of Osun State, Nigeria

O. B. Oyesola and A. O. Ademola

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
E-mail: oyetoks2002@yahoo.com, ob.oyesola@mail.ui.edu.ng, damola.ademola@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS Livelihood Activities. Socio-economic Status. Capital Assets

ABSTRACT Livelihoods are both economic activities (agricultural and non-agricultural) and non-economic activities that people know, own and undertake to earn income today and into the future. This study identifies livelihood activities, abilities, and assets in University of Ibadan social laboratory (Ileogbo community of Osun State, Nigeria). One hundred and eighty respondents were sampled through multistage sampling technique. Qualitative (In-depth Interview with Key Informants and Focus Group Discussion) and quantitative (Interview Schedule) surveys were conducted. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in analyzing the data collected. Result of analysis revealed that 85.8 percent were within ages 20-50 years, 51.7 percent were male, 80.1 percent were married, 54.0 percent were Muslims, 42.1 percent completed secondary school, and 60.2 percent were farmers. More than average of respondents (58.0 percent) had household size of between 1 - 5, 36.9 percent travelled out of the community more than once a week, and 42.6 percent earned averagely between =N=5,000 - =N=15,000 monthly. 77.3 percent of respondents had a low level of livelihood abilities, 80.1 percent had low level of access to natural capital, 80.7 percent had an average level of access to physical capital, 60.2 percent had an average level of access to financial capital, 73.9 percent had a low level of access to human capital, and 79.0 percent had a low level of access to social capital. Result of analysis also showed that 66.5 percent, 55.1 percent and 72.1 percent of respondents had low socio-economic status (poor), access to capital assets, and level of livelihood activities respectively. Significant relationships exist between livelihood abilities (r=0.436, p=0.000), capital assets (r=0.194, p=0.027), socio-economic status (r=0.167, p=0.028), and livelihood activities of respondents. 24 percent of the level of livelihood activities of the respondents was accounted for by livelihood abilities (7.0%), capital assets (0.7 percent), and socio-economic status (1.8%). It is therefore concluded that livelihood abilities contribute more to livelihood activities than access to capital assets and socio-economic status. More so, socio-economic status is directly proportional to livelihood activities. It is recommended that provision of technical, and vocational education, as well as capacity building should be provided by government and non-governmental agencies in Ileogbo, Osun State.

INTRODUCTION

The livelihood concept, according to Chambers and Conway (1992), is based on the premise that a rural household has access to (or has an endowment of) a minimum amount of resource base (capitals or assets), which can be utilised to fashion out a set of livelihood strategies (crop farming, livestock rearing, off farm employment, etc.) to improve its welfare. As defined by Ellis (2000), a livelihood is made up of the abilities, assets (stores, resources, claims, and access) and activities necessary for a means of living. Abilities do not only include sheer physical labour, but also knowledge, trainings, skills, and years of experience. Assets are the basic material or social, tangible or intangible services, resources, skills or attributes. They are the physical, natural, social, financial, and human resources that people use for constructing their livelihoods. Activities are understood in the sense of individual and group activities that transform materials, using the abilities and resources to produce goods and/or services that can be exchanged, especially for a price. Activities in livelihood analysis include income-generating (agricultural and non-agricultural), and non-income generating (for example, religious, environmental, fun/relaxation, etc.).

Kollmair and Gamper (2002) stated that natural assets are forest land (non-timber forest products and wildlife), agricultural land (inherited or acquired), water (stream, well, borehole, or pipe-borne water), soil (fertility), and genetic resources (for example, disease resistant livestock and crops). Human asset represents the household size (demographics), skills (credit management, entrepreneurship, leadership, numerical and language), knowledge (indigenous, non-formal, extension or formal), ability to labour (amount and quality), and health status that one has access to in other people that together

enable one to pursue different livelihood strategies and achieve livelihood objectives.

Financial asset is the medium of exchange critical to the successful utilization o f the other assets. There are two main sources of financial assets:available stocks–savings, bank deposits, livestock, credit, and loans; and regular inflows of money – pension or other transfer from the state, remittances, and incomes. Physical asset comprises of the basic infrastructures (public roads and bridges, power supply, water supply, irrigation system, and information channels) and producer goods (privately owned buildings, machines, and tools). Social assets are developed through networks and connectedness, membership of formalized groups and relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchanges. They are social networks, relations, affiliations, and associations.

The quantity and quality of these assets and access to them, as opined by Oparinde et al. (2008) are influenced by the vulnerability context, which comprises of trends, shocks and seasonality. It is a collection of external pressures that are key factor in many of the hardships faced by poor people. Hazards affect natural capital (for example, floods that ruin agricultural land), physical capital (for example, loss of housing, tools), financial capital (for example, loss of savings), human capital (for example, loss of life, injury, unemployment) and social capital (for example, damage to social networks). People's susceptibility to these hazards is the measure of their vulnerability context, which has direct impact on their assets and consequently affects their livelihood activities.

Trends are long term and usually large scale. They may include changes in main income sources (emergence of new income-generating activities), increased/decreased agricultural production (hybrid crops/livestock), weather variation, impact of mechanisation and agrochemicals, access to markets, variation in prices of foodstuffs and consumer goods, and access to and use of natural resources like water, wood and fodder. Fisher (200 nges, which may include human health shocks (for example, epi-demics), natural shocks (for example, droughts), economic shocks (for example, sudden variations in prices), conflict (for example, between landowners and landless) and crop/livestock pest/disease outbreak. Seasonality is expressed through periodic shifts in prices, production, food availability, employment opportunities and health.

Policies, institutions, and processes may help protect people against the impact of shocks. They are not only conventional disaster mitigation measures, such as public education about risk avoidance, evacuation plans and relief provision, but all kinds of development interventions that build up livelihood assets, for example, microcredit, insurance, health, agricultural extension and organisational development projects. Policies, institutions and processes (sometimes called transforming structures and processes) is stated by Goldman et al. (2000) to be the influences of different levels of government, non-governmental and community based organizations, private sector, traditional institutions, donors, which can be formal or informal on the livelihood of a population.

World Bank (2002) ascertained that one in five people on the planet live in abject poverty. Moreover, DFID (2000) explained poverty to be, not just a question of low income, but to also include other dimensions such as bad health, illiteracy, lack of social services, etc., as well as a state of vulnerability and feelings of powerlessness in general. The number of poor people in rural areas exceeds the capacity of agriculture to provide sustainable livelihood opportunities. Even with a decline in fertility rates or a slowing of population growth, this situation will not change significantly. Migration, one of the livelihood strategies in response to poverty, is inevitable (Dorward et al. 2001). Who is absent (mostly male youths – the active labour force) will have im-plications for agricultural and rural development. While there is potential for out-migration, urban centres cannot be assumed to be capable of providing adequate livelihood opportunities for all those unable to make a living in agriculture (Marsland et al. 2000).

Rural non-farm activities are rapidly becoming escape routes, as they absorb surplus labour in rural areas; help farm-based households spread risks; offer more remunerative activities to supplement or replace agricultural income, offer income potential during the agricultural off-season, provide a means to cope or survive when farming fails. Even at this, inadequate access and control over capital assets, education, and policies still pose constraints to livelihood activities (both farm and non-farm), which in-turn reduce socio-economic characteristics and states in rural areas (Ellis 2000), and undermine sustainable rural development.

To achieve more income, increased well-being, reduced vulnerability, improved food security, and more sustainable use of natural resources, which are the people's livelihood outcomes – there is need for interventions. Interventions from NGOs, private and public institutions have failed in the past because they were not properly adapted to the local context. Therefore, to promote livelihood activities of the target in this study, factors associated with these activities, need to be well analysed for effective sectoral programmes, which is best for livelihood intervention according to Bryceson (1999). It is in view of this that this study seeks to answer the following questions:

· What are the livelihood abilities in Ileogbo community?
· What assets are used for livelihood in Ileogbo community?
· What is the socio-economic status of Ileogbo community?
· What is the level of livelihood activities in Ileogbo community?

Hypotheses of the Study

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between abilities and livelihood activities in Ileogbo community.
Ho2: There is no significant relationship between assets and livelihood activities in Ileogbo community.
Ho3: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status and livelihood activities in Ileogbo community
Ho4: There is no significant difference in the effect of selected socio-economic characteristics, abilities, assets and socio-economic status on livelihood activities in Ileogbo community.

METHODOLOGY

Area of Study

Ileogbo community is in Aiyedire Local Government Area of Osun State along with Kuta, Oluponna, and Oke-Osun communities. Aiyedire Local Government Area is found within Latitude 7°47′00′′ N/Longitude 7°12′00′′ E and Latitude 7.7833333° N/Longitude 4.2° E. It has an area of 262 km² and a population of 75,846 (NPC 2006). Also, it is located in north-western part of Osun State within derived Savannah zone of Nigeria. Other neighbouring communities are Iwo and Ogbagba communities. Ileogbo community is largely agrarian.

Major crops grown are cassava, maize, oil palm, kola, and cocoa while the major livestock reared are goats, sheep, and fowls. Ileogbo community is also known for cassava and palm fruit processing. Non- agricultural activities engaged in are trading, okada/car/bus/pick-up driving for transport, carpentry, welding, hair-dressing, among many others.

Population of Study

The population of this study was men, women, and youths of Ileogbo community that are members of various professional associations/groups in the community.

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Multistage sampling technique was used in selecting 180 respondents for the study. A list of professional associations/groups and their members were obtained to serve as the sampling frame. Fifty percent of the associations and 10 percent of individuals in each were sampled as shown in Table 1.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical tools such as frequency counts, percentages and means were used to describe the data collected, while inferential statistical tools were used to test hypotheses, using Chi-square, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and linear regression

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic Characteristics

Age is an important factor when considering livelihood activities. This is because education, skills, access to capital assets and policy specificity vary across age groups. Therefore, activities vary more across age groups than within it, so also the level of activities. The age distribution in Table 2 further supports the qualitative report that there were more youths in Ileogbo community than adults and the aged. Result of analysis shows that 60.2 percent of respondents

Table 1: Sampling procedure technique

Professions with associations	*Selected associations*	*Number of members*	*10% of the members*
Civil service	Civil service	392	39
Carpentry	Carpentry	89	9
Tailoring	Tailoring	178	18
Trading			
Oil selling	Oil selling	18	2
Mechanic	Mechanic	32	3
Farming	Farming	516	52
Hairdressing	Hairdressing	93	9
Electrician	Electrician	23	2
Palm oil	Palm oil	38	4
processing	processing		
Okada	Okada	87	9
Cab/Bus	Cab/Bus	183	18
driving	driving		
Welding	Welding	21	2
Livestock			
rearing			
Vulcanizing	Vulcanizing	23	2
Plumbing			
Bricklaying			
Barbing			
Blacksmith			
Electronics			
Cassava	Cassava	105	11
processing	processing		
Upholstery			
work			
Saw			
sharpening			
Hunters			
Video			
coverage			
Grinders			
Photo-			
grapher			
Business			
centre			
Total		1798	180

Source: Field survey 2010

are between ages 20-40 years, which corroborates Oludipe (2009) that states that majority of work force are of ages between 20-40 years. Result indicates that most of the respondents are in their productive age and can actively increase their level of activities provided that factors that facilitate these are in place. This observation reveals that rural-urban migration is on the reverse among youth because of non availability of employment and high cost of living in urban centres, which consequently puts more demand on inadequate rural capital assets, but on the other hand promising towards increasing the level of livelihood activities.

Sex consideration is pertinent in livelihood study because males and females have different level of access to capital assets in addition to different roles and responsibilities. These directly influence their options and level of activities. Result of analysis shows that both males and females are actively involved in livelihood activities in Ileogbo community as Table 2 reveals that 51.7 percent of respondents are males and 48.3 percent are females. This is to note that gender mainstreaming will be paramount to the effectiveness and sustainability of any development project in the community. Result of analysis corroborates Ebitigha (2008) and Oludipe (2009) that males still dominate the scene of rural income generating activities.

The place of marital status cannot be undermined when studying livelihood because of its influence on access to capital assets and changing roles and responsibilities. Table 2 shows 12.5 percent singles, 80.1 percent married, 4.0 percent divorced, and 3.4 percent widowed as marital status distribution among respondents. Majority being married shows the importance of marriage institution in Ileogbo community. Result of analysis corroborates Akinola (2007), Ebitigha (2008), and Oludipe (2009) that state that majority of rural work-force was married. Marriage can both increase access to capital assets (especially women) and thereby increase level of activities or otherwise due to pressure on spouses.

Religious institutions go a long way in determining livelihood activities in developing societies. Almost everyone is involved in one religion or the other, which dictates the dos and don'ts and even roles and responsibilities of individuals in the family and community. Result of analysis reveals that 41.5 percent, 54.0 percent, and 4.5 percent of respondents are Christians, Muslims, and Traditional worshippers respectively. Religion is closely related to culture, so all development programmes and policies should be within Ileogbo's religious and cultural context in order for it to be accepted. For instance, the qualitative report indicates that the environment of *Olu* of Ileogbo Palace is culturally rich because of a couple of cultural sites around it. The major ones are *Idi Ore*, a tree which must not be touched and *Odo Oko*, a forest which nothing should be taken out of.

Education improves knowledge, skills and attitudes of persons. Therefore, it plays a major role in increasing access to other resources and ensuring their judicious use. Result of analysis

Table 2: Distribution of respondents based on selected socio-economic characteristics (n=176)

Variable	*Freq*	*%*
Age		
<30	50	28.4
31-40	56	31.8
41-50	45	25.6
51-60	15	8.5
>60	10	5.7
Mean=38.5		
Sex		
Male	91	51.7
Female	85	48.3
Marital Status		
Single	22	12.5
Married	141	80.1
Divorced	7	4.0
Widowed	6	3.4
Religion		
Christianity	73	41.5
Islam	95	54.0
Traditional	8	4.5
Educational Qualification		
Non-formal	6	3.4
Adult education	4	2.3
Primary	49	27.8
Secondary	74	42.1
Tertiary	43	24.4
Occupation		
Crop Farmers	106	60.2
Livestock keepers	29	18.5
Crop processors	24	13.6
Civil servants	33	18.8
Traders	40	22.7
Artisans	60	34.1
Transporters	35	19.9
Household Size		
1-5	102	58.0
6-10	60	34.1
11-15	8	4.5
>15	6	3.4
Mean=5.3		
Cosmopoliteness		
More than once a week	65	36.9
Once a week	20	11.4
Once in two weeks	24	13.6
Once a month	42	23.9
Once in several month	25	14.2
Average Monthly Income (=N=)		
<5000	14	8.0
5001-15000	75	42.6
15001-25000	37	21.0
25001-35000	27	15.3
35001-45000	11	6.3
>45000	12	6.8
Mean=2.9		

Source: Field study 2010

supports qualitative report that Ileogbo community is endowed with high literacy rate. Table 2 bares that 27.8 percent completed primary school, 42.1 percent completed secondary school and 24.4 percent had tertiary education, corroborating Adediran (2008) and Oludipe (2009) that majority of rural work force have secondary school education. This significantly reduces language barriers in communication and promotes policy entry in the community. Besides, residents will be more comfortable with changes and less risk aversive, which holds huge potentials for growth and development.

Occupations are income generating activities, which are series of activities, ventures, and strategies that have economic impact on people's lives. An individual's occupation is the activity he/she knows and engages in to make a living. Olawoye (2000) and Ebitigha (2008) describes the prevalence of engagement of rural household in multiple activities (having more than one occupation) to spread risk, cope with insufficiency and seasonality, compensate failures in credit market, and transit gradually to new activities. One hundred percent of respondents have more than one livelihood activities as also reported in Akintola (2007). Majority of respondents (60.2 percent) were crop farmers, which further supports the qualitative report that Ileogbo community is an agrarian one. This finding corroborates with Akintola (2007) and Oludipe (2009) that the largest percentage of rural dwellers are crop farmers. Also, 34.1 percent, 22.7 percent, 19.9 percent of respondents were artisans, traders, and transporters respectively. More so, 18.8 percent were civil servants, 18.5 percent are livestock keepers, and 13.6 percent are crop processors.

DFID (2001) states that livelihood options are limited by economic constraints, particularly natural and human assets. Household size can both put pressure on household finances and increases household labour. Table 2 uncovers that 58.0 percent, 34.1 percent, 4.5 percent, and 3.4 percent of respondents have household size of between 1 - 5, 6 - 10, 11 - 15, and above 15 respectively. This corroborates the findings of Ebitigha (2008) and Oludipe (2009) that state that majority of households have a size of between one and five. Qualitative report suggests that the small household size is because majority of the wards take up their own livelihood activity or education outside the household activities after secondary school. Besides, family bond is gradually on the loose, so there is a decrease in the number of distant relatives living in households.

The exposure level of people makes them

more enlightened and contributes to their knowledge, skills and attitude, which are resources in the promotion of livelihood activities. Thirty-six point nine percent (36.9%) of the respondents travel out of the community more than once a week. The result reveals that Ileogbo people are well exposed and thus have high aspirations. Majority of the journeys are made to Iwo, Ibadan, Lagos, Abuja and other major cities for education, business, visit and marriage.

It is pertinent to measure level of income in livelihood study because it has direct and vital implication on level of livelihood activities, as it is directly proportional to access to capital assets. Majority of respondents (42.6%) earn between =N=5,000 and =N=15,000, while only 6.8 percent earn above =N=45,000 averagely per month. The income level in Ileogbo is low and explains the yearning for interventions with economic benefit in the community in the qualitative report. This finding corroborates Akinola (2007) and Oludipe (2009) that majority of rural work force make something around =N=10,000 on the average a month.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents based on livelihood abilities

Variables	*Freq*	*%*
Labour (hours/day)		
1-5	64	46.4
6-11	60	34.1
>11	52	19.5
Labour (days/week)		
1-3	61	34.7
4-6	62	35.2
>6	53	30.1
Years of Experience		
1-10	60	34.1
11-20	40	22.7
21-30	51	29.0
31-40	4	2.3
41-50	9	5.1
>50	12	6.8
Number of Active Family Support		
1-3	100	56.8
4-6	56	31.8
>6	20	11.4
Training		
Indigenous	84	47.7
Non-formal	61	34.7
Formal	31	17.6
Support		
Extension	58	33.0
Social	118	67.0

Source: Field study 2010

Livelihood Abilities

Ellis (2000) states that livelihood ability does not only include sheer physical labour, but also knowledge, trainings, support, skills and years of experience. Labour is measured by the number of hours work per day, and days per week. It is thus expected that the higher the livelihood ability of an individual, the higher his/her level of activities. Table 3 shows that majority 46.4 percent work 1-5 hours/day, 35.2 percent work 4-6 days/week, 34.1 percent have 1-10 years of experience, 56.8 percent have active family support of between 1-3, 47.7 percent have indigenous training, and 67.0 percent of social support. The limited hours' and days' labour is because most respondents distribute their time among various income generating activities, which consequently alter the growth and development of any of those activities. Majority of respondents are youths and middle-aged people, which accounts for limited experience in their activities. Many of them have moved from one activity to another over the years and so did not build up long enough experience in a particular one.

Furthermore, limited percentage of household size in Table 2 transforms into limited percentage of active household support among respondents in Table 3. Qualitative report states that women and children hardly follow the men to the farm anymore, as each member of the household now have their different livelihood activities towards household's livelihood outcomes. Since majority of respondents are farmers, indigenous training is the most prevalent in the community. However, majority of respondents get more support from social groups than from extension agents, this is partly because a handful of the respondents are not full-time farmers, having little or nothing to do with extension. Besides, qualitative survey reveals that many farmers only regard material input from extension as support, excluding the information and training.

Table 4 reveals that 77.3 percent of respondents have a low level of livelihood ability while only 2.8 percent has high level of it. This infers that Ileogbo community residents have low capacity to increase their livelihood activities and socio-economic status. Hence, there is a need for more extension support in terms of capacity building in various aspect of livelihood within the context of changing times.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents based on level of livelihood abilities

Level of livelihood abilities	*Freq*	*%*
Low (16-85)	136	77.3
Average (86-155)	35	19.9
High (>155)	5	2.8
Total	176	100.0

Source: Field survey 2010

Access to Capital Assets

Table 5 reveals that 80.1 percent of respondents have low level of access to natural capital. In addition, qualitative report revealed that motivation for more natural capital is low due to low capacity to make them productive. This shows that many natural assets lie fallow in Ileogbo community. This called for concerted effort to put these natural assets to productive use and thereby increase livelihood activities in the community. Result of analysis on Table 5 shows that 80.7 percent of respondents have an average level of access to physical capital. The qualitative survey explains that this is so because Ileogbo community is headquarter of Aiyedire Local Government and therefore have a relatively high level of social infrastructure (roads, boreholes, schools, and clinics). Findings corroborate Ebitigha (2008) that states that there is a medium access to physical capital. However, access to production equipment is low. For promotion of livelihood activities, social infrastructure and production goods need to be at the same range of adequacy.

Table 5 shows that 60.2 percent of respondents have average level of access to financial capital. The satisfactorily access to financial capital is due to respondents' significant adoption of informal credit and thrift (*esusu*) and informal savings and credit (*ajo*). Efforts should therefore be made to institutionalize these financial sources for better and more frequent access to fund. Human capital represents the skills, knowledge, manpower and good health of an individual's household that together support him/her in pursuing various livelihood strategies (Ellis 2000). Table 5 bares that majority (73.9%) of respondents have low human capital, hence little household support/labour, which resultantly decreases household's level of livelihood activities. Table 5 uncovers that 79.0 percent of respondents have low social capital and only 1.7 percent has high social capital. Result of analysis corroborates Ebitigha (2008) that states that access to social capital is low. Hence, a need to motivate and mobilise inhabitants of Ileogbo community into social groups through which development interventions can reach them and make impacts in their lives.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents based on their access to capital assets

Access to capital	*Freq*	*%*
Access to Natural Capital		
Low (1-31)	141	80.1
Average (32-62)	26	14.8
High (>62)	9	5.1
Access to Physical Capital		
Low (1-25)	22	12.5
Average (26-50)	142	80.7
High (>50)	12	6.8
Access to Financial Capital		
Low (0-7)	57	32.4
Average (8-15)	106	60.2
High (>15)	13	7.4
Access to Human Capital		
Low (0-71)	130	73.9
Average (72-142)	33	18.7
High (>142)	13	7.4
Access to Social Capital		
Low (2-7)	139	79.0
Average (8-13)	34	19.3
High (>13)	3	1.7
Access to Capital Assets		
Low (80-167)	97	55.1
Average (168-255)	59	33.5
High (>255)	20	11.4

Source: Field survey 2010

An average (55.1 percent) of the respondents have low access to capital assets (natural, physical, financial, human, and social assets). Also, 33.5 percent of respondents have average access to capital assets, while only 11.4 percent of them have high access to them. DFID (2000) ascertained that access to capital access to capital assets is directly proportional to livelihood activities, hence there is need to boost Ileogbo dwellers' access to capital assets to promote their livelihood and socio-economic status.

Socio-economic Status

Table 6 reveals that 66.5 percent of respondents have low socio-economic status, while 31.2 percent and 2.3 percent have average and high access respectively. Majority having low socio-economic status suggests a low level of livelihood activities and high level of livelihood

diversification, which is common in poorer households. Result of analysis corroborates Adediran (2008) that majority of rural work force are poorer than average.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents based on their socio-economic status

Socio-economic status	*Freq*	*%*
Poor (22-49)	117	66.5
Average (50-77)	55	31.2
Better-off (>77)	4	2.3
Total	176	100.0

Source: Field survey 2010

Livelihood Activities

DFID (2001) stated that livelihood activities are economic activities that people know, own and undertake to earn income today and into the future. Livelihood activities undertaken by people are shaped by their inherent capabilities and assets. It is therefore explainable that 72.1 percent of respondents have low level of livelihood activities as livelihood abilities and access to capital assets are low. The low level of livelihood activities (both agricultural and non-agricultural) consequently adds up to low socio-economic status of respondents as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents based on their level of livelihood activities

Level of livelihood activities	*Freq*	*%*
Low (4-12)	127	72.1
Average (13-24)	45	25.6
High (>25)	4	2.3
Total	176	100.0

Source: Field survey 2010

Result of analysis on Table 8 reveals that a significant relationship exists between abilities and livelihood activities in Ileogbo community, so the null hypothesis is rejected. Ability is positively significant because in livelihood study, it is beyond sheer labour, but includes knowledge, training, skills, years of experience, family/extension support, and health status. These components come together to increase the level of activities of respondents and when lacking or inadequate, decrease the level *hitherto*. To increase livelihood abilities in the community, efforts should be made to encourage tertiary education, provide technical and vocational training, with effective extension support.

Table 8: Correlation between abilities/capital assets/socio-economic status and livelihood activities of respondents

Variable	*r-value*	*p-value*	*Decision*
Abilities / Livelihood activities	0.436	0.000	S
Access to capital assets / Livelihood activities	0.194	0.027	S
Socio-economic status / Livelihood activities	0.167	0.028	S

Source: Field survey 2010S at $p \leq 0.05$
r – correlation coefficient
p – probability coefficient S – significant

Table 8 indicates that significant relationship exist between access to capital assets and livelihood activities of respondents. The positive relationship implies that people with high access to capital assets have higher level of livelihood activities than ones with average and low access. This corroborates DFID (2001) which states that livelihood activities are limited by numerous constraints, among which are natural assets (land, livestock, water) and human assets (family structure and skills). They are also limited by social, cultural, economic, infrastructural, and political factors, particularly caste and wealth.

Result of analysis in Table 8 shows that significant relationship exists between socio-economic status and livelihood activities of respondents. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Socio-economic status increases with increase in level of livelihood activities, but not with livelihood diversification as Ebithiga (2008) reveals. An individual will rather increase his/her level of livelihood activities than take up more portfolios once he/she can afford better standard of living on his/her activities. Efforts to increase the socio-economic status of people should thus be focused on increasing their level of livelihood activities.

Regression Equation of the Relationships between Abilities, Capital Assets, Socio-economic Status and Livelihood Activities of Respondents

$$y = a + 0.070x1 + 0.007x2 + 0.018x3$$

Where y = livelihood activities

a = constant
x1 = livelihood abilities
x2 = capital assets
x3 = socio-economic status

Result of analysis shows that livelihood abilities, capital assets and socio-economic status account for 24.0 percent of changes in the level of livelihood activities. Seven percent of which is contributed by livelihood abilities, capital assets contribute 0.7 percent, while socio-economic status contributes 1.8 percent. The implication of this is that livelihood abilities contributes highest to livelihood activities, followed by socio-economic status, and lastly capital assets. This shows that education, training and extension support have high impact on livelihood activities in Ileogbo community.

CONCLUSION

It can be deduced that livelihood abilities (an individual's capacity to labour, knowledge, skills, good health, and support) contribute more to livelihood activities than access to capital assets and socio-economic status.Socio-economic status was directly proportional to livelihood activities. This means that an individual with high socio-economic status had an increased level of livelihood activities. Majority of the respondents had low level of livelihood abilities, capital assets, socio-economic status, and livelihood activities, while there was a high livelihood diversification among them. Majority of people in the study area are between ages of 20-50 years, married, Muslims and males. They have formal education and engaged in farming as primary occupation. Their non-agricultural activities are very diverse and include carpentry, tailoring, trading, and civil service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Education, especially tertiary, should be encouraged in the community. Efforts should be made to establish technical, and vocational schools, which in addition to knowledge will provide employable and entrepreneurship skills for Ileogbo community. Provision of good health care facilities (clinics, drugs, health workers, drainage, and sanitation) should be considered. Health contributes notably to livelihood abilities and human capital, both of which were found insufficient in the community. In addition to provision of infrastructures, production goods should be adequately provided. Tractor hiring services, inputs services units, and group and mechanized storage and processing stations are recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

MacArthur Foundation, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

REFERENCES

Adediran David 2008. *Effect of Livelihood Diversification on Socio-economic Status of Rural Dwellers in Ogun State, Nigeria*. M.Sc. Thesis, Unpublished. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Akintola Bosede 2008. *Social Capital and Income Generating Activities of Rural Women in Ondo State, Nigeria*. M.Sc. Thesis, Unpublished. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Bryceson DF 1999. African rural labour, income diversification and livelihood approaches. A long term development perspective. *Review of African Political Economy*, 80(1): 171–189.

Chambers R, Conway G 1992. Sustainable rural livelihoods. Practical concepts for the 21st century. *Institute of Development Studies (IDS) Discussion Paper 296* in Brighton, Sussex.

DFID 2000. Realising Human Rights for Poor People: Strategies for Achieving the International Development Targets. From <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/../tsphuman.pdf> (Retrieved on 12 May, 2010).

DFID 2001. Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets Section2. London. From <http:www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance_sheets_pdfs/section2.pdf> (Retrieved on 27 January, 2010).

Dorward A, Anderson S, Nava Y, Pattison J, Paz R, Rushton J, Sanchez-Vera E 2009. Hanging in, stepping up and stepping out: Livelihood aspirations and strategies of the poor. *DFID Development Policy Review*, 27(2): 131-146.

Ebitigha Oluwakemi 2008. *Effects of Livelihood Diversification on Rural Households Socio-economic Status in Osun State, Nigeria*. M.Sc. Thesis, Unpublished. Ibadan: University Of Ibadan.

Ellis F 2000. The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51(2): 289-302

Fisher S 2002. A Livelihood Less Ordinary. Applying the Sustainable Liveihoods Approach in the Australian Indigenous Context. From <http://www.icat.org.au/media/research/work.pdf> (Retrieved on 19 December, 2009).

Goldman I, Carnegie J, Marumo M, Munyoro D, Kela N, Ntonga S, Mwale E 2000. Institutional support for sustainable rural livelihoods in Southern Africa: Results from Zimbabwe, Zambia and South Africa. *Overseas Development Institute Natural Resource Perspectives*, 50: 1-2.

Kollmair M, St. Gamper J 2002. The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. *Input Paper for the Integrated Training Course of NCCR North-South Aeschiried, Switzerland (IP6)* in University of Zurich, September 9 to 20, 2002.

Marsland N, Robinson E, Davis J, Gordon A, Long S 2000. Policy and Research on the Rural Non-farm Economy: A Review of Conceptual, Methodological and Practical Issues. Chatham, UK: *Natural Resources Institute Paper*. From <http://www.nri.org /../PolicySeriesNo14.pdf> (Retreived on 20 June, 2009)

Olawoye JE 2000. Agricultural Extension Delivery in a Democratic and Deregulated Economy. *Paper Presented at the 6th Annual Conference of Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria* in University of Ibadan, 12th - 14th April, 2000.

Oludipe Bolatito 2009. *Livelihood Activities of Artisanal Fisher Folks in Epe Local Government Area of Lagos State, Nigeria.* M.Sc. Thesis, Unpublished. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Oparinde A, Birol E 2008. Impacts of HPAI on rural livelihoods: Conceptual and analytical frameworks. *Africa/Indonesia Team Working Paper,* 10: 3-6.

World Bank 2002. *Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management. Policy Challenges and Opportunities*. European Commission (EC). United Nation Development Programme. Washington D.C.: World Bank.