

1 **The influence of Farmers' Gender on Factors Affecting Maize production among Small**  
2 **Scale Farmers in the Agricultural Reform Era: The Case of Western Region of Kenya**

3  
4  
5 **Original Research Articles**

6  
7 **ABSTRACT**

8  
9 The introduction of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) and trade liberalisation resulted  
10 in agricultural reforms in Kenya and other developing countries. Hence the Kenya government  
11 no longer gives incentives to small scale farmers. Therefore, the small scale farmers, extension  
12 service and the government at large have to look for all ways to increase maize production in the  
13 country, hence the study. Men and women both make significant contributions in maize-based  
14 farming systems and livelihoods, although gender roles in maize cultivation vary greatly across  
15 and within regions. Their contribution to agricultural work varies even more widely, depending  
16 on the specific crop and activity. The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of  
17 Farmers' Gender on Factors Affecting Maize production among Small Scale Farmers in the  
18 Agricultural Reform Era: The Case of Western Region of Kenya. This is because maize is the  
19 main staple for most of the Kenyan population and Western Region is the food basket. The  
20 study used Ex-post facto research design via cross sectional survey. Busia, Bungoma, Mt. Elgon  
21 and Lugari Counties were purposively selected to represent the Western Region of Kenya. Two  
22 sub-counties from each of the four Counties were selected by simple random sampling. For  
23 uniformity purposes 200 small scale farmers were selected from focal areas through systematic  
24 random sampling hence ensuring that they all had been exposed to extension staff. Four key  
25 informants were sampled purposefully based on their positions of authority. In addition, 52  
26 extension staffs were sampled through systematic random sampling. The small scale farmers  
27 were interviewed with the help of interview schedule containing open and closed ended  
28 questions. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results of the multiple regression  
29 illustrated that there was a statistically significant relationship between factors affecting maize  
30 production among small scale farmers (adoption of improved agricultural practices, attitude  
31 towards maize farming attitude towards farmer organizations and attitude towards opinion  
32 leaders) and farmers' gender. The results showed that the adjusted  $R^2=0.090$ ,  $F=3.830$  at  $p < 0.01$   
33 and  $df=8$ . The study recommended that the Kenya government, extension service and researchers  
34 should pay more attention to the women small scale farmers, who form a large percentage of the  
35 small scale farmers in the western region, yet produce less bags of maize in order for Kenya to  
36 be food secure. There was therefore need for further research to find ways of motivating women  
37 small scale farmers to increase maize production in the Western Region of Kenya.

38  
39  
40  
41 **INTRODUCTION**

42  
43 Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) as propagated by the International Monetary Fund  
44 (IMF) and the World Bank in the 1980s in Kenya occurred against a background of the country's  
45 declining economic performance, which increased poverty levels [9]. The trend has continued to  
46 date with agricultural production and especially maize production declining.

47  
48 Agricultural Sector in Kenya is the backbone of the country's economy and the source of  
49 livelihood for majority of the rural population. The sector contributes about 26 percent of the  
50 country's GDP, employs about 75 percent of the population and is a major source of food to  
51 Kenya's growing population [3] [4]. The small scale farmers are expected to purchase their  
52 inputs, source for information on increasing production, store their own produce and seek for the  
53 best markets for their produce. One of the main issues in this regard is the lack of and the poor  
54 conditions of rural roads linking the farmer's facilities and the commercialization spots in the  
55 country. All challenges are solved differently by the men and women small scale farmers [6].  
56 There is therefore need more researches to be carried out on the factors affecting maize  
57 production by gender among small scale farmers in the western region of Kenya, which is the  
58 main maize producing area In Kenya  
59

### 60 **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

61 The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of Farmers' Gender on Factors Affecting  
62 Maize production among Small Scale Farmers in the Agricultural Reform Era: The Case of  
63 Western Region of Kenya  
64

### 65 **METHODOLOGY**

66  
67 Ex-post facto research design was used via a cross sectional survey. The study used naturally  
68 occurring treatments on subjects having a self-selected level of the independent variable [7]; [2].  
69

70 The study was conducted in Western Region which is administratively divided into six counties  
71 as shown on Fig. 1 & 2. The region is made up of Busia, Bungoma, Kakamega, Lugari: Vihiga  
72 and Mt. Elgon counties. The Region covers an area of 8436 Km<sup>2</sup> out of this 6670 Km<sup>2</sup> has  
73 potential for agriculture of which, 3591 Km<sup>2</sup> is cultivated for various crops. Rainfall is bimodal.  
74 The long and short rains come in March-May and August-November periods, respectively.  
75 Annual rainfall ranges from 900mm in Busia to 2100mm in Bungoma [12].  
76  
77



Fig. 1. Map showing the Western Region of Kenya

78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83



84  
85  
86 **Fig. 2. Map showing the Counties in the Western Region of Kenya**

87  
88 The target population was made up of small scale farmers in the Western Region. The accessible  
89 population is as shown in Table 1.

90  
91 **Table 1. Showing the Study Accessible Population**

92

<b>District</b>	<b>Accessible population</b>
Lugari County	41,809
Bungoma County	158,370
Mt. Elgon County	19,746
Busia County	136,736

93  
94 Busia, Bungoma, Mt. Elgon and Lugari counties were selected through purposive sampling  
95 because Busia County had the lowest average maize yields (7 bags per acre) in the region  
96 while, Lugari County experienced the highest average maize yield (18 bags per acre).  
97 Bungoma and Mt. Elgon counties were in-between in terms of maize yield [5]; [10]. The four  
98 counties also represented Western Region in terms of all the Agro-ecological zones that exist  
99 in the Region and therefore, results obtained could be generalized to the whole Region.

100  
101 Two sub-counties from each of the four selected counties were selected by simple random  
102 sampling. The study sub-counties were Bumula and Webuye in Bungoma County; Kaptama  
103 and Kapsokwony in Mt. Elgon County; Funyula and Butula in Busia County and Lugari and  
104 Likuyani in Lugari County (figure 2).

105  
106  
107 For uniformity purposes the small holder farmers were selected from focal areas through  
108 systematic random sampling thus ensuring that they all had been exposed to extension staff. At  
109 the time of data collection, the extension staff had trained the farmers in one focal area per

110 division and had moved to the next. The focal area approach which is under the National  
 111 Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) aims at improving livelihoods of the  
 112 poor rural households [11]. In the focal area approach the extension staffs works in one area of  
 113 approximately 400 farmers per year. The focal area is taken as a demonstration site where  
 114 farmers from the rest of the division can learn latest technologies [1]. The key informants were  
 115 purposefully sampled due to their positions of authority.

116  
 117 The sample size was arrived at using the following formula:

118  
 119 
$$n = NC^2 \div C^2 + (N-1)e^2$$

120  
 121 (*note:* n=sample size; N=population size; C=Coefficient of variation which is 30%; e=margin of  
 122 error which is fixed between 2-5%). The study sample was calculated at 25% coefficient of  
 123 variation and 5% margin of error [13] [5] [7].

124  
 125 For the purpose of generalizing the results to Western Region, twenty five percent coefficient of  
 126 variation was used to ensure that the sample was wide enough. Five percent margin of error was  
 127 used because the study was an ex-post facto survey. In ex-post facto survey the independent  
 128 variables are not be manipulated hence necessitating relatively higher margin of error. The study  
 129 sample is shown in Table 2.

130  
 131 The small scale farmers and extension staff were selected through systematic random sampling  
 132 from sampling frames that were obtained from the extension staff offices. Four key informants  
 133 were interviewed in order to generate additional information and clarify issues on the reform  
 134 measures that had taken place. The key informants included the Provincial Director of  
 135 Agriculture and Livestock Extension, the Provincial Crops Officer, an officer in position of  
 136 authority in Agricultural Finance Corporation and an officer in position of authority at the  
 137 National Cereals and Produce Board, Western Region. The small scale farmers were interviewed  
 138 with the help of interview schedules and the extension staff were asked to fill questionnaires

139

140 **Table 2. Total number of subjects by category from which the sample was drawn**

Category	Number of subjects	Sample size
Extension staff in the Region	832	52
Household heads in Busia County	136,736	50
Household heads in Lugari County	41809	50
Household heads in Bungoma County	158370	50
Household heads in Mt. Elgon County	19746	50
Key Informants		4
Total	357,493	256

141  
 142 The study sought to determine the relationship between factors affecting maize production  
 143 among small scale farmers in the agricultural reform era, by gender, in Western Region.

144  
 145  
 146

147 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

148

149 The results of the multiple regression illustrated that there was a statistically significant  
150 relationship between factors affecting maize production among small scale farmers (adoption of  
151 improved agricultural practices, attitude towards maize farming attitude towards farmer  
152 organisations and attitude towards opinion leaders) and farmers' gender. The results showed that  
153 the adjusted  $R^2=0.090$ ,  $F=3.830$  at  $p < 0.01$  and  $df=8$ . Hence the null hypothesis was rejected.

154

155 The study further sought to establish the differences in the factors affecting maize production  
156 among small scale farmers between men and women farmers. The differences in maize yield  
157 between men and women farmers were also determined. The results revealed that there was a  
158 statistically significant difference at 0.05 significant level in maize yield ( $F=12.038$ ,  $df=1$ ).  
159 However, there was no statistically significant difference between adoption of improved  
160 agricultural practices ( $F=3.582$ ,  $df=1$ ), attitude towards farmer organisation ( $F=0.100$ ,  $df=1$ ),  
161 attitude towards maize farming ( $F=0.305$ ,  $df=1$ ) and attitude towards opinion leaders ( $F=2.695$ ,  
162  $df=1$ ) between men and women small scale farmers.

163 To facilitate discussion of the gender differences in maize yield, adoption of improved  
164 agricultural practices, and farmers' attitude towards maize farming, farmer organisations opinion  
165 leaders, cross tabulations were run. The results were as shown in Tables 3-6. The results revealed  
166 that more women farmers (71.4 %) achieved maize yield of less than 11 bags per acre as  
167 compared to 47.9% of the men farmers who achieved the same yield. On other hand, more men  
168 farmers (27.6%) achieved maize yields of over 16 bags per acre compared to the 16.6% women  
169 farmers who achieved the same yield as shown in Table 3. The low yields realised by women  
170 farmers could be explained in part by the factors shown in Table 4.21-4.23.

171 **Table 3: Percentage Men and Women Farmers Who Achieved Various Maize Yields per**  
172 **Acre**

173 <b>Maize yield</b>	<b>Women farmers (%)</b>	<b>Men farmers (%)</b>
174 $\leq$ bags per acre	30.8	21.4
175 6-10 bags per acre	40.6	26.5
176 11-15 bags per acre	12.0	24.5
177 16-20 bags per acre	8.3	9.2
178 21-25 bags per acre	5.3	4.1
179 Over 25 bags per acre	3.0	14.3
180 <b>TOTAL</b>	100	100

181 Table 4 illustrates that more men farmers (60.6%) adopted either three quarters or all the  
182 improved agricultural practices taught by the extension staff, as compared to 46.2% women. On  
183 the other hand, more women farmers (32.1%) than men farmers (25.3%) either did not adopt or

184 adopted only one quarter of the improved agricultural practices. This explains in part the reason  
 185 why women farmers generally achieved lower maize yields than men farmers.

186

187

188 **Table 4: Cross Tabulation of Adopted Improved Agricultural Practices by Gender**

189

Extension packages passed and adopted by farmers					
	None of the Packages Passed	Quarter of the packages Passed	Half of the packages passed	Three quarters of the packages passed	All of the packages passed
194 Men	19.2	6.1	14.1	21.2	39.4
195 Women	28.4	3.7	21.6	14.9	31.3

196 Cross tabulations of attitude of farmers towards maize farming, farmer organisations and opinion  
 197 leaders indicated that relatively more women farmers (55.2%) had either very poor or poor  
 198 attitude towards maize farming as compared to 47.9% men farmers. On the contrary, more men  
 199 farmers (52.1%) had average to very good attitude towards maize farming as Compared to 44.8%  
 200 of women farmers as shown in Table 5.

201 The results further showed that relatively more women farmers (27.6%) had very poor to poor  
 202 attitude towards farmer organisations as compared to 24.5% of men farmers with the same  
 203 attitude towards farmer organisations. On the other hand, more men farmers (75.5%) had average  
 204 to positive attitude towards farmer organisations as compared to 72.4% of the Women farmers as  
 205 shown in Table 4. Generally, both men and women farmers had average to very good attitude  
 206 towards opinion leaders. However, more women (7.5) had very poor to poor attitude towards  
 207 opinion leaders as compared to 3.1 % of the men farmers. The extension service, the government  
 208 and other stake holders may have to give more emphasis to problems facing women farmers if  
 209 food production in Western Region and in the country should improve.

210

211

212

213

214

215

216 **Table 5: Attitude of Farmers towards Maize Farming, Farmer Organisation Opinion**  
 217 **Leaders by Gender**

218		Very poor (%)	Poor (%)	Average (%)	Good (%)	Very good (%)	n
219	<b>Attitude towards maize farming</b>						
220	Men	11.2	36.7	48	3.1	1	98
221	Women	10.4	44.8	33.6	11.2	0	134
222							
223	<b>Attitude toward farmer organisations</b>						
224							
225	<b>Men</b>	4.1	20.4	40.8	31.6	3.1	98
226	<b>Women</b>	10.4	17.2	39.6	27.6	5.2	134
227	<b>Attitude toward opinion leaders</b>						
228	Men	0	3.1	52	42.9	2	98
229	Women	1.5	6	61.9	26.9	3.7	134

230  
 231 Table 6 shows that slightly more women (37.3%) than men (21.1%) had planted maize on land  
 232 sizes of less than one acre. In addition, more men (45.5%) than women (37.4%) farmers had land  
 233 sizes of more than four acres. Similarly, more men farmers (52.7%) had acquired secondary  
 234 school education or above as compared to the women farmers (23.2%). Furthermore, correlation  
 235 coefficients indicated statistically significant relationships (Pearson correlation of 0.180, at  $p <$   
 236  $0.007$ ) between education level and maize acreage and between education level and maize yield  
 237 (Pearson correlation of 0.262 at  $p < 0.0005$ ). This implies that men farmers are in a better  
 238 position to realise higher yields in agricultural production than women farmers. Simplified  
 239 extension packages should be designed for women farmers.

240 The high maize acreage, farm acreage and education levels give men an edge over women  
 241 farmers. This is because the high levels of education possessed by men will help them  
 242 understand improved agricultural practices passed by extension staff making adoption of these  
 243 practices easy. Table 6 further shows that more men farmers (32.3%) had some form of  
 244 employment compared to 27.6% women farmers who had some form of employment. For  
 245 farmers to be productive they need money to buy farm inputs, indulgence of men farmers in  
 246 other forms of employment earns them extra income which may enable them to purchase farm  
 247 inputs, hence as are able to adopt improved agricultural practices.

248



249 **Table 6: Maize Acreage, Education Level, Farm and Other Occupations Possessed by Men**  
 250 **and Women farmers**

251	<b>Maize Acreage</b>	<b>men (%)</b>	<b>women (%)</b>	<b>Education level</b>	<b>Men (%)</b>	<b>Women (%)</b>
252	No response	1.4	1.0	none	4.3	17.6
253	<1 acre	19.7	36.3	primary level	43.0	59.2
254	1-3 acres	62.0	46.1	secondary level	47.3	21.6
255	4-6 acres	7.0	9.8	college/ university	4.3	1.6
256	7-9 acres	1.4	1.0		1.1	0.0
257	≥ 10 acres	8.5	5.9			
258	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
259	<b>Farm size</b>				<b>Other occupations</b>	
260	<1 acre	7.0	5.1	none	67.7	72.4
261	1-3 acres	47.5	57.5	self employed	18.2	20.9
262	4-6 acres	21.2	23.9	church/ community	4.0	1.5
263	7-9 acres	8.1	6.0	formal employment	8.1	5.2
264	10-12 acres	5.1	3.0	politician	2.0	0.0
265	>12 acres	11.1	4.5			
266	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

267

268 **CONCLUSION**

269 More male small scale farmers achieved more bags of maize yield per acres compared to the  
 270 women small scale farmers, more men farmers (60.6%) adopted either three quarters or all the  
 271 improved agricultural practices taught by the extension staff, as compared to 46.2% women.  
 272 relatively more women farmers (55.2%) had either very poor or poor attitude towards maize  
 273 maize farming, farmer organizations and opinion leaders as compared to 47.9% men farmers.  
 274 The study also revealed that most of the small scale farmers who had small farm sizes were  
 275 women, they also had low education levels, that is below primary level and they were not  
 276 involved in any other occupations apart from farming.

277

278 **RECOMMENDATION**

279 In order for Kenya to be food secure. the Kenya government, extension service and researchers  
280 should pay more attention to the women small scale farmers, who form a large percentage of the  
281 small scale farmers in the western region.

282

## 283 REFERENCES

284

285 1. Baiya, F. M. (2003). Focal area extension planning: National agriculture and livestock  
286 extension programme field guide notes. Nairobi, Kenya, Government Printers; 2003.

287

288 2. Borg, WR, Gall, MD. (1993) Education research: An introduction. New York: Longman  
289 Inc; 1993.

290

291 3. Chamala (1987). Adoption process and extension strategies for conservation farming. In  
292 "Tillage: New Directions in Australian Agriculture (Eds P.S. Cornish and J.E. Prately)  
293 pp.400-19. (Inkata Press: Melbourne).

294

295 4. Ombuki Charles (2018). Factors affecting maize production in Kenya International  
296 Journal of Arts and Commerce Vol. 7 No. 6 July

297

298 5. Central Bureau of Statistics (2001). The 1999 population and housing census, Nairobi,  
299 Kenya: Government Printers

300

301 6. Guerin and Guerin (1994). Guerin LJ, Guerin TF. Constraints to the adoption of  
302 innovations in agricultural research and environmental management: a review. Australian  
303 Journal of Experimental Agriculture.34 (4).549-571

304

305 7. Kathuri N. J, Pals, DA. (1993). Introduction to educational research. Njoro, Kenya:  
306 Educational Media Centre, Egerton University.

307

308 8. Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (2019). The Major Challenges of the Agricultural  
309 Sector In Kenya

310

- 311 9. Kodhek, GA (2005). Contemporary issues determining the future of Kenyan agriculture:  
312 An agenda for policy and research.2005; Available:  
313 [http://www.yahoo.Agenda\\_pol\\_research\(1\).htm](http://www.yahoo.Agenda_pol_research(1).htm)  
314
- 315 10. Ministry of Agriculture, (2006). Western Region annual report; 2006.  
316
- 317 11. Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. (2006).  
318 Impact assessment NALEP Phase 1. Nairobi, Kenya: Ministry of Agriculture and  
319 Ministry of Livestock Development; 2006.  
320
- 321 12. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2002). Department of Agriculture  
322 Western Region 2001 annual report; 2002  
323
- 324 13. Nassiuma D. K. (2000). Survey sampling: Theory and methods. Njoro, Kenya: Egerton  
325 University Press; 2000.  
326
- 327 14. Republic of Kenya. (2010). Agricultural sector development strategy 2010-2020. Nairobi,  
328 Kenya: Government Printers; 2010.  
329
- 330 15. Republic of Kenya (2013a). Crops act; Kenya Gazette Supplement. Nairobi, Kenya:  
331 Government Printers; 2013.  
332
- 333 16. Republic of Kenya (2013b). Ministry of Agriculture Food Security Assessment Report.  
334 Nairobi, Kenya: Government Printers; 2013.  
335
- 336 17. World Bank. 1994. Governance - the World Bank's experience (English). Development  
337 in practice. Washington, D.C. : The World Bank. s to farmers  
338