

CHALLENGES OF FAMILY FARMING IN ATYAP CHIEFDOM, ZANGON KATAF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

^{*1}Manza, E.A.G., ¹Makarau, S.B., ²Damina, A., ¹Garba, A.O., ¹Bivan, G.M. and ¹Bayei, D. J.

¹Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension, Kaduna State University, Kafanchan Campus,
P.M.B. 1010 Kafanchan, Kaduna State

²Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic, Samaru-Kataf Campus, Zonkwa, Kaduna State

** Corresponding Author – E mail: rhodelgevan@yahoo.com*

Received 22nd December, 2015 Accepted 4th April, 2016

Abstract

The study aimed at identifying the socio-economic characteristics of the households; examine the role of family members in family farming and to identify the farm challenges faced by the farmers in the study area. Five (5) out of the sixteen (16) districts in the chiefdom were selected randomly for the study. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that the mean age of respondents was 56.3 years, the mean family size was 8 persons and the mean years of farming experience was 39.2 years. The two most popular family farming methods were found to be “badundung” and “gaya”. Fifty-one percent of the respondents reported that communal work made the work easier and faster while 12.1% reported that communal farming united the community. The four major farm constraints in 2013 were inadequate inorganic fertilizer, flood, inadequacy of other farm inputs and storage facilities. In 2014, the four major farm constraints were diseases infection, inadequacy of other farm inputs, inorganic fertilizer and farm credit from formal sources. It was recommended that in view of the fact that agricultural extension coverage is quite low, the Zangon Kataf Local Government Area and the Kaduna State Government should support agricultural extension adequately through the recruitment of additional farm agents as this will enhance farm productivity and higher income. In addition the Atyap Community Development Association (ACDA) and the Atyap Traditional Council should encourage farmers in the area to continue with communal farming given the absence of cheap labour saving devices on the farm.

Key words: Challenges, Family, Communal, farming, Socio-economic characteristics,

Introduction

Agriculture can and does provide the largest source of employment to the rural poor in most of the developing world. This not only increase their incomes and food security but also facilitates reduction of poverty for a sustainable livelihood. In Nigeria, it is the predominant occupation as it is said to employ up to 70 percent of the rural population (Manza, 2014).

Family farming is defined as a system of organizing agricultural, forestry, fisheries, and pastoral production which is managed and operated by the family and is predominantly reliant on non wage family labour provided by both men and women (Praharaj, 2014). Family farming is one of the most predominant forms of agriculture both in developing and developed countries. The sector comprises a wide spectrum of farm sizes and types, ranging from very large land holdings in high income economies that are easily cultivated by one or two family members with the use of labour saving machinery and hired labour to the small holdings of a few hectares or less in low income economies.

Family farming includes all family-based agricultural activities and is linked to several areas of rural development. It has an important socio-economic, environmental and cultural role. In all its diversity, it is the predominant form of agriculture worldwide and local and global food security depends on it. It generates food and income for households of millions of rural people, including the poor and marginalized, creates jobs for women, men and young people, both within their family farms and in related enterprises and agricultural value chains. It also provides models of adaptability and resilience for more sustainable food production, and is socially and culturally part of communities and territories constituting nations, and as such underpins national food security in most countries; safeguards and protects environmental assets and natural resources, bio-diversity and cultural heritage (Praharaj, 2014). Family members also play a pivotal role in the local production, marketing and consumption circuits that are so important not simply in fighting hunger but also in creating jobs, generating income, and in stimulating and diversifying local economies (daSilva, 2014).

Worldwide, there are an estimated 500 million family farms. In an FAO survey of 93 countries, family farms accounted on average over 80 percent of all farm holdings. In developed and developing countries alike, they are the main producers of food consumed locally and the primary stewards of food security (daSilva, 2014). There are at least 1.5 billion small scale family farmers across the world that depend largely on their own production for food and livelihoods while making huge contributions to local and global food markets and to food security. Nevertheless, a large proportion of those who live in extreme poverty are family members (ILC, 2013). Family farming is very important as it is a source of food for the household and the country at large. It also provides employment and income. In addition, family farming strengthens family and social ties in areas where community farming still exists to prepare land, weed and harvest (Muhanguzi, 2014).

Family members are a diverse group, including not only arable farmers but other groups who largely depend on renewable natural resources, including mobile pastoralists and hunters, fisher-folk, urban farmers and a variety of indigenous groups. Small numbers of family members are well integrated into agricultural markets, able to grow and profit from farming with a majority surviving on combining subsistence and market production with part time employment and other sources of income with no clear route to prosperity. Many more are unable to make ends meet and are coming under pressure to abandon the land, yet without good alternatives often times. Agricultural development policies often fail to address the livelihood needs of this diverse array of small producers or mobilize their potential contributions to food security and economic development. (ILC, 2013).

Small family farms are the key to reducing poverty and improving global food security. Much of the world's experience in sustainable farming systems has been gained by family-run farms. From generation to generation, family farms have transmitted knowledge and skills, preserving and improving many practices and technologies that can support agricultural sustainability. According to Muhanguzi (2014) throughout Kenya, farmers are using innovative techniques to produce and distribute food. He also revealed that family farming was being done on roof tops, in community gardens and anywhere there was space (Muhanguzi, 2014).

The 2014 World Food Day theme "Family Farming: Feeding the World, Caring for the Earth" was chosen to raise the profile of family farming and small holder farmers. It focused the world's attention on the significant role of family farming in eradicating hunger and poverty, providing food security and nutrition, improving livelihoods, managing natural resources, protecting the environment and achieving sustainable development. The United Nations General Assembly also designated 2014 as the "International Year of Family Farming", the idea being that the international community would recognize the important contribution of family farmers to food security. During the celebration of the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF), the IFAD Secretary General said that the celebration had elevated the role of small holder farmers as agents of change for alleviating rural poverty and ensuring food security for all". According to him, IFAD believes that small holder and family farmers can and should be at the forefront of the transformation of world agriculture.

Challenges of Family Farming

Family farming faces a number of challenges, both long-term and new. These challenges are unlikely to threaten the continued existence of family farming as a dominant system. However, individual farms – especially small holdings providing a major share of household incomes – may disappear, and give way either to more competitive rural or urban land uses, or to essentially non-commercial uses such as wildlife reserves or human residence (Davidova and Thomson, 2014). In a study conducted by Davidova and Thomson (2014), it was found that the main economic challenges to family farms are access to farming resources such as land and capital, and access to markets, particularly in terms of bargaining power in the food chain. The authors maintained that access to land was restricted by the small proportions of land coming onto the market, by the high price of land, and by the need for suitably located and serviced areas. Large corporate farms often distorted the land rental market (Ciaian *et al.*, 2012a).

Access to financial capital, especially via formal channels, may be expensive for small farmers, who are unwilling to risk their land as collateral. Often, family farmers work within credit constraints, a situation which frequently impedes investments in technological

improvement and farm growth (Blancard *et al.*, 2006; Blakucs *et al.*, 2009).

According to Ingram and Kirwan, 2011, national legislation on family inheritance often makes it difficult to arrange fair and smooth succession of farms from one generation to the next. Davidova *et al.*, (2013) revealed that family farms need to compete not only in terms of efficiency (scale, productivity) but also in terms of innovation and entrepreneurship (Davidova *et al.*, 2013).

Given their generally small size relative to other actors in the food chain, family farms need to collaborate via various forms of producer organizations, such as cooperatives, in order to gain scale economies and negotiating power on markets and for policy. Another challenge of family farming is the unwillingness to form cooperatives which was why Lerman (2012) emphasized on this by stating that “there is a strong resistance to the entire notion of cooperatives among some rural people.

Social challenges to family farming include attracting younger generations to farming as an occupation and adequately recognizing the contribution of women. A major challenge for family farming, according to Davidova and Thomson (2014), is inter-generational succession which triggers the adoption of new technology, the consolidation/or fragmentation of agricultural land and the restructuring of farm enterprises. The authors opined that a national legislation over inheritance be put in place which can have a key impact on the consolidation, or conversely on the fragmentation, of land and farm assets. They cited the *Code Napoleon* inheritance system, which requires assets to be passed to all children in equal shares, and which has led to a prevalence of small farms, and fragmented holdings (scattered fields) in many EU countries (Davidova and Thomson (2014)).

Ending hunger and poverty can be achieved, if family farming and small holder farmers are made to be the centre of rural development efforts. It is against this background that the study seeks to achieve the following research objectives:

- to identify the socio-economic characteristics of the households in the study area;
- to examine the role of family farming in the study area; and
- to identify the challenges of family farming in the study area.

Methodology

The Study Area

The study area is Zangon Kataf Local Government Area (LGA) of Kaduna State, Nigeria. Kaduna State is in the North-West zone of Nigeria and has 23 LGAs. Zangon Kataf LGA, being among the 23 LGAs, has its headquarters at Zonkwa. The LGA lies between Latitudes 09°30'N and 10°08'N and Longitudes 07°27'E and 08°30'E and has a population figure of 316,370 persons (NPC, 2006). The population was projected to be 420,061 persons in 2015 given a growth rate of 3.2 percent per annum. The LGA is bordered by Kaura and Jema'a LGAs to the South-East and South respectively, Kachia LGA to the West and Kauru and Lere LGAs to the North and North-East respectively. The LGA lies largely in the Guinea savannah ecological zone of Nigeria. The soil type is sandy loam which favours the production of most crops ranging from maize, sorghum, soybean, groundnut and tree crops. Majority of the inhabitants are farmers with small farm holdings. Crops and livestock production is their primary occupation with few civil servants, petty traders, artisans, and businessmen. The LGA consists of four chiefdoms namely, Atyap, Bajju, Ikulu and Kamantan chiefdoms representing the Atyap, Bajju, Ikulu and Kamantan tribes respectively. There are however other tribal groups residing in the LGA such as the Chawai, Hausa, Fulani, Yoruba, Igbo, Kachechere and Kurama.

Atyap Chiefdom

The Atyap Chiefdom is located between Latitudes 9°40'N and 10°N and Longitudes 8°15'E and 8°40'E in Zangon Kataf LGA, Kaduna State. It lies in the south-eastern part of Kaduna State. It is bordered to the east by the Chawai, to the south-east by the Moroa and Attakar, to the south by the Kagoro, to the south-west and west by the Bajju. The Ikulu also occupy part of the west but they predominate in the north-west. The far north is occupied by the Surubu of Lere LGA (Achi, 2008). The study area lies completely within the tropics and therefore is characterized by a tropical climate. The area is alternated by two seasons – the dry season and the wet season. The dry season lasts for about five (5) months from November to March, while the rainy season last for seven (7) months from April to October with rainfall averaging 1600mm per annum. This relatively high amount of rain fall in this part of the State is a contributing factor in determining farm production. Also, the climate in Atyap Chiefdom is influenced by its proximity to both

the Kagoro hills and Jos Plateau. Atyp land falls within the Southern Guinea Savannah Zone.

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

The Atyp Chiefdom consists of 16 districts, namely; Bafai District, Gora Gan District, Gora Gida (Kanai Mali) District, Gidan Zaki District, Jankasa District, Kibori District, Mabushi District, Magamiya District, Manchong District, Mayi-agwui District, Ruhogo District, Takanai District, Ungwan Gaiya District, Zaman

Dabo District, Zango Urban District and Zonzon District.

A two-stage sampling procedure was employed for data collection. Firstly, random sampling was carried out to select 5 districts out of the 16 districts. The selected districts were Bafai, Gidan Zaki, Zonzon, Jankasa and Ungwan Gaiya Districts. Secondly, farming households were randomly selected across the village areas in each of the selected districts as shown on Table 1.

Table 1: Sampling frame and Sample size of respondents for the study

District	Sampling Frame	Sample Size
Bafai	290	29
Gidan Zaki	300	30
Zonzon	310	31
Jankasa	290	29
Ungwan Gaiya	300	30
Total	1490	149

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014/15 Cropping Season

Data Collection

Primary data were used for the study. The data were obtained through the use of structured questionnaires administered amongst the respondents by the researchers and trained Extension Agents as enumerators from the Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project (KADP), Samaru zone. This was supplemented with interviews and personal observations over the study period. The specific information obtained from the respondents included those on socio-economic characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, household size, farm size, educational attainment, extension contacts and years of experience; input supply activities; production activities; non-productive and marketing activities; and farming constraints.

Analytical Tools

Simple descriptive statistical tools including percentages, frequency distribution and arithmetic mean were used.

Results and Discussion

Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Households

Gender of Household Head

The results in Table 2 showed that 139 respondents, constituting 93.3% of the total respondents, were males while the remaining 10 respondents, constituting 6.7% of the total respondents, were females. The predominance of male household heads in the study area can be attributed to the labour intensive nature of agricultural activities which can be very tedious, hectic and time consuming especially for females who have to combine farming activities with their domestic chores. Another reason for male dominance can be attributed to the general belief in the study area that a woman should not inherit a farmland except for very few cases.

Table 2: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area

Variable	Frequency (n = 149)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)	Mean
Gender of Household Head				

Male	139	93.3	93.3	
Female	10	6.7	100.0	-
Age (Years)				
21 – 30	10	6.7	6.7	
31 – 40	21	14.1	20.8	
41 – 50	36	24.2	45.0	
51 – 60	31	20.8	65.8	
61 – 70	11	7.4	73.2	
71 – 80	27	18.1	91.3	
81 – 90	13	8.7	100.0	56.3
Household Size				
1 – 5	36	24.2	24.2	
6 – 10	98	65.8	90.0	
11 – 15	9	6.0	96.0	
16 – 20	5	3.3	99.3	
21 – 25	1	0.7	100.0	7.5
Educational Attainment				
Never been to School	20	13.4	13.4	
Adult Education	15	10.1	23.5	
Primary School	27	18.1	41.6	
Secondary School	47	31.5	73.1	
Tertiary Institutions	40	26.9	100.0	-
Farming Experience (Years)				
1 – 10	7	4.7	4.7	
11 – 20	22	14.8	19.5	
21 – 30	21	14.1	33.6	
31 – 40	40	26.8	60.4	
41 – 50	25	16.8	77.2	
51 – 60	22	14.8	92.0	
61 – 70	11	7.3	99.3	
71 – 80	1	0.7	100.0	39.2
Extension Contacts				
No Extension Contacts	111	74.5	74.5	
Weekly Extension Contacts	3	2.0	76.5	
Monthly Extension Contacts	4	2.7	79.2	
Quarterly Extension Contacts	20	13.4	92.6	
Yearly Extension Contacts	11	7.4	100.0	-

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014/15 Cropping Season

Household Size

The result of the study in Table 2 showed that 98 households, constituting 65.8% of total respondents had a household size of 6 -10 members. The household size ranged from 1 person to 22 persons with an average of 8 persons per household indicating that farmers in the study area had moderate household size. The higher the family size the greater the possibility for family farming. This is because more family members may most likely be available to work on the farm.

Age of Household Head

The age of the farmers ranged between 20 – 85 years. The result of the study in Table 2 showed that about 45% of the total respondents were within the age range of 20 - 50 years while about 55% of the total respondents were above 50 years of age. The mean age of the respondents was 56.3 years implying that they were relatively advanced in age and outside the productive age of 25 – 50 years. Some communities in Nigeria are populated with aged men and women who are left

behind as a product of rural – urban drift in search of white collar jobs. Thus, output productivity will be quite low since age determines the physical strength of the farmers.

Educational Qualification of Household Heads

The findings of the study as shown in Table 2 indicated that 13.4% of total household heads had no formal education, 10.1% had adult education, 18.1% had primary education, 31.5% had secondary school education and 26.8% had some form of tertiary education. This finding shows that an average farmer in the study area was fairly educated and therefore had greater chances for increased awareness and adoption of recommended production technologies as observed by Okoye *et al.* (2004) and La'ah *et al.* (2012).

Years of Farming Experience

The finding as shown in Table 2 indicates that only 4.7% of the respondents had between 1 - 10 years of farming experience whereas about 95.3% had more than 10 years experience in

farming. The average years of farming experience of the sampled respondents was 39.2 years. Therefore, it can be inferred that the sampled respondents had sufficient experience in farming. The greater the years of family farming the better for that household as more years put into farming account for more capacity to adopt and sustain any introduced technology into the community over the years as stressed by La'ah *et al.* (2012).

Extension Services

The result of the study in Table 2 further showed that only 25.5% of the sampled respondents indicated that they had been visited by an extension agent while 74.5% of the respondents indicated that they were not visited by an extension worker. It is deeply worrisome that a greater number of households had no access to extension services as this must have hampered agricultural production, farm productivity, farm incomes and food security. Similarly, the result in Table 2 showed that out of the 38 households who had contact with extension agents, only 7.9% were visited once every week while 28.9% were visited only once during the year. This low level of extension contact would hardly create impact in these households. One wonders what would be discussed no matter how long the visit lasted.

These few contacts left many households without extension contact or extension messages.

Household Members' Participation in Family and Communal Farming

Members of the household's participation in family farming

The study observed that all the households studied indicated that agriculture was either their primary occupation or a secondary occupation. This shows the importance of agriculture in Atyap Chiefdom. This finding agrees with that of Achi (2008) who reported that the Atyap people are overwhelmingly farmers. Not only were the adults involved in farming but the youths too. As indicated in Table 3, 81.9% of male youths in the households' studied indicated that their role was to work on the farm while 18.1% saw their role as supporting their parents. On the other hand, the results in Table 3 revealed that 40.1% of the female youth members in the sampled households saw their role as helping on the farm. This was followed by 23.1% of the female youth members who saw their role as cooking for the family. These findings showed that family farming has been a great success given the understanding of the role of each family member and their participation in farm work.

Table 3: Role of Male and Female Youth Members in the Family

Role (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative	Frequency
Male Youth Members				
Work on the Farm	122	81.9	81.9	
Help in Farm Work	27	18.1	100.0	
Female Youth Members				
Work on the Farm	15	10.1	10.1	
Help in Farm Work	59	39.6	49.7	
Convey Farm Materials to and from Farm	11	7.4	57.1	
Cook for the Family	34	22.8	79.9	
Assist the Family	30	20.1	100.0	

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014/15 Cropping Season

Communal farming

The result in Table 4 showed that 88.6% of sampled respondents involved themselves in communal (community) work while only 11.4% of the respondents indicated they did not. The same result of the study in Table 4 also described the types of communal farming practiced in the study area. The two major types were *badudung* (47.0%) followed by *gaya* (41.6%). However, 11.4% indicated that they did not engage in any form of communal farming.

The result of the study as shown in Table 4 equally showed the perceived benefits derived

by these households for practicing communal farming in the area. Fifty one percent (51.0%) of the respondents indicated that it made the farm work easier and/or faster. One household each or 0.7% of the respondents studied indicated communal work enabled them to catch up with the farming season and to build relationships. To catch up with the season would mean to those households that may not have had many family members or who were not able to hire labourers to work out on their farms. In that sense, communal work would assist them to plant as and when due. Furthermore, Table 4 showed that

12.1%, 11.4%, 6.0% and 4.0% of the households indicated that communal farming helped to unite the community, assist one another, provide cheap

labour and encourage large scale farming respectively.

Table 4: Classification of respondents according to types and benefits of communal farming

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Types of Communal Farming			
None	17	11.4	11.4
Badudung	70	47.0	58.4
Gaya	62	41.6	100.0
Benefits of Communal Farming			
No recognizable benefits	17	11.4	11.4
It makes the work easier and faster	76	51.0	62.4
It unites the community	18	12.1	74.5
Allow farmers to help each other on the farm	17	11.4	85.9
It is a means of having cheap labour	9	6.0	91.9
Encourages individuals to work on their farm	4	2.7	94.6
Catch up with the farming season	1	0.7	95.3
Encourage large scale farming	6	4.0	99.3
Build relationships	1	0.7	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014/15 Cropping Season

Farm Constraints

Table 5 showed the farm constraints faced by the farmers in the year 2013 and 2014. In terms (14.8%), inadequacy of other farm inputs (13.0%) and inadequate storage facilities (13.0%). Closely followed by these were inadequate farm land (9.3%), inadequate farm credit (7.4%), and poor extension service which ranked 10th (1.9%). In 2014, the four top ranked farm constraints were

of ranking, the four highest constraints in 2013 were inadequate inorganic fertilizer (22.2%), flood diseases' infections (27.6%), inadequacy of other farm inputs (14.8%), inadequate inorganic fertilizers (13.8%) and inadequate farm credit (13.0%). These constraints had the implication of limiting farm production and invariably farm profitability and food security in these years.

Table 5: Constraints associated with family farming in the study area

Constraints	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ranking
Inadequate farm credit	7	12.1	4 th
Inadequate Inorganic fertilizers	8	13.8	3 rd
Inadequate farm land	7	12.1	5 th
Inadequate storage facilities	6	10.3	6 th
Inadequate rainfall	1	1.7	8 th
Inadequate transportation facilities	4	6.9	7 th
Inadequate farm inputs	9	15.5	2 nd
Diseases infestation	16	27.6	1 st
Floods	-	-	-
Inadequate extension services	-	-	-

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014/15 Cropping Season

Conclusion and Recommendation

Attempt has been made to highlight the socioeconomic characteristics of household heads

in the study area. The result showed that 93.3% of the respondents were males, aged 56.3 years on the average, were engaged full time in agricultural production and had an average household size of 8 persons. The respondents were fairly educated with 86.6% of them having attained some form of formal schooling. The average period of experience in farming was 39.2 years with 74.5% of the respondents had no contact with extension agents. Therefore, the longer the respondents were engaged in family farming, were better educated and had more access to extension agents and information, the

more their experience and chances of adopting the best production practices.

A number of constraints were also identified militating against the practice of family farming in the study area namely, the prevalence of diseases infestation, inadequate farm inputs notably inorganic fertilizer, inadequate credit facilities, inadequate land to farm, storage facilities and roads and high cost of transportation.

The study recommends the following solutions, among others:

Inadequacy of farm inputs need to be addressed by the farmers themselves using their umbrella cooperative groups as the present system of provision of farm inputs by the Local Government and the State Government does not appear to be reaching farmers in the area;

In view of the fact that agricultural extension coverage is quite low, the Zangon Kataf LGA and the Kaduna State Government should support agricultural extension adequately through the recruitment of additional extension agents. This would enhance farm productivity, increase farm incomes and food security.

The Atyp Community Development Association (ACDA) and the Atyp Traditional Council should through campaigns encourage

farmers in the area to continue with communal farming given the absence of cheap labour saving devices on the farm as this will enhance farm productivity;

The establishment of agricultural price support programmes, easier access to credit from formal sources through simplifying the lending terms, favorable interest rates and using guarantors instead of landed property for collateral security would encourage increased farm production; and The development and adoption of improved, high yielding, disease resistant varieties of crop plants and breeds of livestock would also increase farm production.

References

- Achi, B.S. (2008). Impact of British Colonialism on the Atyp, `1890 – 1960. Unpublished B.A History Project, Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. pp 1 – 24
- Adebayo, O.O. (2011). The Impact of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Microcredit Scheme on the Food Security Status of Farm Households, Kaduna State. PhD Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. pp 60 – 63
- Bakucs, L., Fertő, I. and Fogarasi, J. (2009). Investment and Financial Constraints in Hungarian Agriculture. *Economics Letters*, 104: 122 – 124
- Blancard, S., Boussemart, J.P., Briec, W. and Kerstens, K. (2006). Short- and Long- run Credit Constraints in French Agriculture: A Directional Distance Function Framework using Expenditure-Constrained Profit Functions. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 88(2): 351–364
- Ciaian, P., Kancs, d'A., Swinnen, J., Van Herck, K. and Vranken, L. (2012a). Key Issues and Developments in Farmland Sales Markets in the EU Member States and Candidate Countries. *FP7 Factor Markets Project Working Paper No. 12*. Available at www.factormarkets.eu/system/files/FM_WP12%20CEPS%20on%20Key%20Issues%20in%20Farmland%20Sales%20Markets_D14.1_final.pdf.
- Ciaian, P., Kancs, d'A., Swinnen, J., Van Herck, K. and Vranken, L. (2012b). Key Issues and Developments in Farmland Rental Markets in EU Member States and Candidate Countries. *FP7 Factor Markets project Working Paper No. 13*. Available at www.factormarkets.eu/system/files/FM_WP13%20CEPS%20on%20Key%20Issues%20in%20Farmland%20Rental%20Markets_D14.2_final.pdf.
- Da Silva, J. G. (2014). The Family Farming Revolution. An Opinion Article by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Director.
- Davidova, S. and Thomson, K. (2014). Family Farming in Europe: Challenges and Prospects. In depth Analysis
- Davidova, S., Bailey, A., Dwyer, J., Erjavec, E., Gorton, M. and Thomson, K. (2013). *Semi-Subsistence Farming – Value and Directions of Development*. Study prepared for the European Parliament Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/AGRI/studiesdownload.html?languageDocument=EN&file=93390>.
- Davidova, S. and Thomson, K. (2013). Family Farming: A Europe and Central Asia

- Perspective. Background Report for Regional Dialogue on Family Farming: Working towards a Strategic Approach to Promote Food Security and Nutrition [Draft]. Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Europe/documents/Events_2013/FF_EU_CAP_en.pdf.
- Feichtinger, P. and Salhofer, K. (2011). The Valuation of Agricultural Land and the Influence of Government Payments.FP7 Factor Markets project Working Paper No. 10. Available at <http://www.factormarkets.eu/content/key-issues-and-developmentsfarmland-rental-markets-eu-member-states-and-candidate-countries>.
- Food and Agricultural Organization, FAO (1992). Population Education and Nutrition: Version for Africa. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- Ingram, J. and Kirwan, J. (2011). Matching New Entrants and Retiring Farmers through Farm Joint Ventures: Insights from the Fresh Start Initiative in Cornwall, United Kingdom. *Land Use Policy*, 4:917 – 927
- International Food and Agricultural Development, IFAD (2014). *International Year of Family Farming: IFAD's Commitment and Call for Action*.www.familyfarming.com. Accessed on the 20/12/2014
- International Land Coalition, ILC (2013). How can Land, Governance and Support to Small-scale Family Farming work Together to Strengthen Food Security and reduce Poverty. Findings of ILC Global Research Project. www.familyfarming.com. Accessed on the 20/12/2014
- Lerman, Z. (2012). Land Reform and Farm Performance in Europe and Central Asia: A 20 years Perspective. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem Discussion Paper No 2.12. Available at: http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/120260/2/Lerman_ECALandReform_WP2012_1.pdf.
- La'ah, B.A., Shehu, M.B. and Garba, A.O. (2012). Economic Analysis of Backyard Lima Bean (*Phaseolus lunatus*) Production among Women in Zangon Kataf Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria. *Journal of Farm Management*, 13(1): 103 -
- Makarau, S.B., Banta, A.L. and Abiyong, P.A. (2009). Comparative Economic Analysis of One Seeded and Two Seeded Groundnut Production in Zangon Kataf Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria. *Gurara Journal of Vocational Technology*, 1:128 – 132
- Manza, E.A.G. (2014). Impact of Promoting Sustainable Agriculture on Food Security, Farm Income and Rural Livelihoods in Southern Borno State, Nigeria. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Manza, E.A.G. and Abdulsalam, Z. (2014). Food Security Status of Households in Promoting Sustainable Agriculture Project in Southern Borno State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics (NIJADE)*, 4: 47
- Muhanguzi, F. (2014). Household Farming in Uganda Improves Nutrition and Livelihoods. Interview in observance of World Food Day, the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA) discusses the role of family farming in Uganda with Francis Muhanguzi, a FANTA Nutrition Specialist – Gender and Agriculture www.familyfarming.com accessed on the 11/12/2014.
- National Population Commission, NPC (2006). *The 2006 National Population Report, Nigeria*.
- Okoye, B.C., Okorji, E.C. and Asumugha, G.N. (2004). Outlook on Production Economics of Paddy Rice under Resource Constraints in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria (ASON) held between 17th – 21st October, 2014 in Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria. pp 337 – 342
- Olayemi, J.K. (1998). Food Security in Nigeria. *Research Report No. 2*, The Development Policy Centre, Kaduna, Nigeria. 82pp
- Praharaj, M. (2014). Family Farming needed to prevent Hunger and Poverty: Being Paper Presented at the Department of Architecture, College of Engineering

Technology, Bhubaneswar, India on
16th October, 2014