# DETERMINANTS OF TRAINING NEEDS OF POULTRY FARMERS IN NORTHERN AGRICULTURAL ZONE OF PLATEAU STATE, NIGERIA

# E. Simon<sup>1</sup>, E.S. Salau<sup>2</sup> and H.S. Umar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Veterinary Extension and research Liaison services Division, National Veterinary Research Institute, Vom.
<sup>2</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Nasarawa State University Keffi, Shabu campus Corresponding Authors Email: <u>eminvri2009@gmail.com</u> Phone: +2348129842182

### Abstract

This study assessed the determinants of training needs of poultry farmers in the Northern Agricultural Zone of Plateau State, Nigeria. Primary data were collected from nineteen (119) respondents with the aid of structured questionnaires using multistage sampling techniques. Data were analyzed with descriptive statistics such as percentage and mean scores and logit regression model. Results showed that the mean age of the respondents was 43 years while majority (72.3%) was married. Majority (98.3%) had one form of formal education or the other. The mean household size was 5 persons. The mean years of farming experience were 7years. The average amount of credit received was №190,420.17. The mean farm size was 671 birds and the mean annual farm income was №1,002,208.55. Majority (68.9%) sourced their information on poultry production from poultry farmers. The respondents expressed the need for more training. The coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$  value was 0.672. The variables level of education (P-value = 0.000) was positively significant at 1%, age and number of training attended (P-value=.0.042 and P-value =0.021) respectively were significant at 5%. The study recommends that. Extension efforts should be geared towards encouraging poultry farmers to sponsor training workshops and seminars by inviting resource persons to address their areas of poultry management training needs. Adequate, free and complete information on poultry training programmes should be made available to the respondents by the government.

Keywords: Training Needs, Poultry Farmers, Northern Agricultural Zone, Plateau State

### Introduction

Poultry refers to all birds of economic value to man. Examples of poultry are chickens, pigeon, duck, quail, guinea fowl and ostrich. According to Adewole (2017) poultry has been on earth for over 150 million years dating back to the original mild jungle fowl. The scientific name for chicken is *Gallus Domestica* (*s*). Poultry production provides food to a man in form of meat, egg, and manure which helps improve soil fertility. The interest in poultry and poultry products have grown tremendously in the last 20 years, almost every country in the world is involved in poultry production.

The poultry industry occupies a prominent position as a major source of animal protein.

According to Farayola *et al.* (2013) in virtually all rural areas, poultry production is carried out on small scale under the extensive or traditional and semi-intensive system.

In modern agriculture, the need for efficiency in agricultural productivity is further multiplied by the fact that useful resources are extremely scarce and become scarcer every day as a result of natural depletion and effects of social pressure such as population urbanization. For agriculture to achieve optimal production levels evidence have pointed to services that develop farmers' abilities to manage available resources in a better way.

Training programmes in agriculture is designed to develop farmers to make them

better entrepreneurs and decision-makers and also to help them organize themselves into effective associations and institutions (Famuyiwa *et al.*, 2012). For training to be more effective, efficient and have a high impact there is a need to conduct a training need assessment. To conduct a training needs assessment is to pinpoint if training will make a difference in productivity, to decide what specific training each needs and what will improve their performances (Chukwu, 2013).

The role of training in the socio-economic development of a nation cannot be overemphasized as it is the driver to the development of rural farmers. Training in any form is intrinsic to organizational effectiveness and efficiency. It is seen as a process of education for providing the individual with genuine professional end product is competence. Its the development of innate leadership and managerial ability, intellectual understanding of the substance, the know-how of the management profession and the ability to apply that understanding to actual management (Moreki situations and Keaikitse, 2013).

Training according to Ogunlade (2017) is a planned and systematic effort to modify or develop knowledge, skills or attitude through the learning experience, to achieve effective ii. performance in an activity. A significant relationship has been found between training and competencies of the target population iii. (Okwoche et al 2015). Livestock farmers' competencies could be enhanced through iv. proper training programmes. Training consists largely of well-organized opportunities for participants to acquire the necessary understanding and skills. According to Arowolo (2017), farmers' training is directed towards improving their job efficiency in farming.

Despite the overwhelmingly important role poultry production plays in the economy of Nigeria, it is unfortunate that Extension Agents or workers that are supposed to take innovations to the farmers seem to sidetrack poultry farmers. Pandey (2015) reported lack of adequate effective training of poultry farmers has been a major constraint that has resulted in a reduction of poultry production patterns resulting in a supply gap to meet the expanding population consumption demand. There is a lack of adequate training from extension workers about innovativeness and incentives for poultry production to achieve the desired change.

A lot of poultry production enterprises abound in Plateau State that can provide gainful employment opportunities for the teeming population, especially the youths. It is, however, not know the extent of training received by poultry farmers in the zone. It is not also certain the training needs of poultry and the constraints faced by these poultry farmers. This indeed provides the basis for this research.

The general objective of the study is to assess the determinants of training needs of poultry farmers in the Northern Agricultural Zone of Plateau State, Nigeria while the specific objectives are to:

- i. describes the socio-economic characteristics of the poultry farmers in Northern Agricultural Zone of Plateau State;
- i. identify the sources of information on poultry production used by the respondent;
- . identify the training needs of the respondents; and
- v. vi. assess the determinants of training needs of the respondents

### Methodology

The study was conducted in the Northern agricultural zone of Plateau State, Nigeria. Plateau State is located in the Northern middle area of Nigeria. The State is mostly rocky and the area contains within its infractions chains of hills and many captivating rock formations. The name 'Plateau State was derived from the State's spectacular geographical landscape, with the high lands rising from 1,200 meters above sea level at the low lands to speak of 1,829 meters above sea level. It shares a boundary to the West with the Kaduna State, to the North with Bauchi State, to the South part with Benue State and the East with Taraba and Nasarawa States. The State has seventeen Local Government Areas (LGAs) with Jos town as the headquarters. It lies between the latitude of  $80^{\circ} 24^{1}$  and longitude  $80^{\circ} 32^{1}$  east of the Greenwich Meridian. It is situated in the tropical zone, with a higher altitude ranging from 12 meters about 400 feet to a peak of 1829 meters above sea level. The State covers a total land area of 53,385 square kilometers. It has a population of 3'178.712 persons consisting of 1,593.033 males and 1,585,679 females with a population growth rate of 2.7 per annum (NPC, 2006).

The Plateau State is classified into three agricultural zones which are the northern, central and southern zones. The LGAs understudy in the northern zone includes Jos South and Jos Ease. The northern zone of the Plateau State falls within 500-1500metres above sea level. This zone has very rough terrain, mainly comprised of hills, steep slopes, bare rock surfaces and deep gullies. Soils which are mainly grey to red sandy ferric to gleyiccambisols have been severely eroded due to the steep slopes and heavy rains. Destruction of soils as a result of mining activities has further restricted agricultural activities to marginal crops like acha, tamba, millet sweet potato. Annual rain

varies between 1140-1580mm distribute over 160-200 rain days. With adequate fertilizer supplements and the use of improved varieties, good crops of maize, Irish potato, upland rice, and vegetables are being produced. Livestock types include cows, sheep and goats, pigs and poultry. (Federal Information Service Centre (FISC 2016).

The target population for the study was all poultry farmers in the Northern Agricultural Zone of Plateau State. A multi-stage sampling procedure was used in the selection of the respondents. Stage one involved purposive selection of Two (2) LGAs namely Jos East and Jos South out of the six that make up the Northern LGAs Agricultural Zone of the State. This was due to the availability of intensive poultry farmers in the Local Government Areas. Stage two (2) involved a purposive selection of five (5) districts from the two LGAs one (1) from Jos East (Fobor) and 4 from Jos South LGA (Vwang, Du, Gyel and Kuru). The third stage involved a purposive selection of 2 villages from each of the 5 districts this gave a total of 10 villages namely Kerker, Laminga, K/Vom, Chaha, Rayfield, Loholgut, Sort, Raholkat, Kuru-Jenta and Trade-Centre. In the fourth (4) stage, a preliminary survey was conducted in each of the ten (10) villages to have a census of the poultry farmers (see Table 1) sixty percent (60%) of the identified poultry farmers in each of the 10 villages were selected to give a total of 119 respondents for the study.

| LGAs      | Districts | Villages     | Sampling Frame | Proportional Selection (60%) |  |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|----------------|------------------------------|--|
| Jos East  | Fobor     | Kerker       | 15             | 9                            |  |
|           |           | Laminga      |                | 14                           |  |
| Jos South | Vwang     | K/Vom        | 18             | 11                           |  |
|           | -         | Chaha        | 21             | 12                           |  |
|           | Du        | Shen         | 22             | 13                           |  |
|           |           | Rayfiel      | 20             | 12                           |  |
|           | Gyel      | Sort         | 19             | 11                           |  |
|           |           | Raholkat     | 24             | 14                           |  |
|           | Kuru      | Kuru Jenta   | 18             | 10                           |  |
|           |           | Trade Centre | 22             | 13                           |  |
| Total     | 5         | 10           | 202            | 119                          |  |

Table 1: Sampling frame for selected Poultry farmers in the study area

# Methods of data collection

Primary data were used for this study and were collected through the use of a structured questionnaire. Data were collected on socio-economic characteristics of the poultry farmers, sources of information on poultry management, training needs of the respondents and determinants of training needs.

Descriptive statistics like percentage and mean scores were used to achieve objectives i and ii while objective iv was achieved using the Logit regression model. A 3-point Likert-type scale was used to measure objective iii.

The Logit model has the following functional form following the Pindyck and Rubifield (1981).

Ln (Pi/ (1-Pj)) = Zi =  $\beta o + \beta i Xi + e \dots (1)$ 

The Logit model is based on the cumulative logistic probability function. The dependent variable Zi is the Logarithm of odds that a particular choice will be made. It is an index reflecting the combined effect of Xi factors that promote or prevent the training needs of poultry farmers. The importance of each factor is influenced by the coefficient of probabilities within a (1, 0) range interval to the problem of predicting odds of events occurring within the range of a real line. The Logistic model is estimated using the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE).

The estimated model is specified as follow.

Li = In (P/(1-P)) =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + ... + \beta_9 X_9$  +e (2)

### Where

Li + Logit or log of odds ratio Z = Training needs of Poultry farmers (1= needed, 0= not needed)  $X_1$  = Age of respondents (years)  $X_2$  = Years of poultry farming experience (years)  $X_3$  = Level of education (years of formal schooling)  $X_4$  = Extension contact (No of visit)  $X_5$  = Years of cooperative membership (years)  $X_6$  = number of birds kept  $X_7$  = Membership of cooperative

(Yes=1, No=0)

 $X_8$  = Amount of credit obtained in the last 3 years in naira

 $b_1 - b_4 = Regression coefficients$ 

e = error term.

While a 3-point Likert type scale was used to measure objective iii. Nineteen (119) training needs were listed on a 3-point Likert type scale of highly needed, needed and not needed and assigned a weight of 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The weighted sum for each source was obtained by multiplying the points scale by the number of respondents in each scale. The weighted mean score of less than 2.0 implies training is needed while the weighted mean of 2.0 and above implies training is not needed.

### **Results and Discussion**

# Poultry farmer's socio-economic characteristics

The socio-economic characteristic of the respondents is presented in Table 2. The result showed that 51.3% of the respondents were males while 48.7% were female. This suggests that women were less involved in poultry farming activities in the study area. This may be attributed to the fact that poultry enterprise is a highly risky venture, labour intensive and characterized by uncertainties which in most cases can only be handled by men. The results concur with the findings of Babatunde et al (2012); Babalola (2014) who reported that the majority of the poultry farmers in Nigeria were male. Ibitoye and Omisimi (2013) also reported that more men were found in poultry farming in Kogi State than women.

The result in Table 1 also reveals that 52.1% of the respondents were within the age range of 41-60 years. The minimum age was 20 years and the maximum was 65 years with a mean age of 43 years. This means that most of the respondents were still in their active and productive age; an economic active age can make a positive contribution to poultry production and agriculture in general.

Majority (58.8%) of the respondents acquired secondary education, 24.4% had primary education, and 15.1% had tertiary education while only 1.7% had no formal education. This shows that most of the respondents in the study area are educated. This agrees with the findings of Farayola (2013) who reported that formal education helps to enhance farmers' abilities to understand and evaluate new agricultural production techniques. Imonikhe (2010) noted that education increases farmers' ability to make positive and meaningful farm management decisions.

The result further revealed that the majority (72.3%) of the respondents were married,

(60.5%) had household sizes ranging from 1-5 persons with a mean of 5 persons. (Table1). The data showed that 83.2% of the respondents had 1-10 years of working experience with a mean of 7 years with only 30.3% belonging to cooperative societies while only 33.6% had access to credit. About 59% of the respondents used their savings as capital for poultry production and the average amount of credit received per annum was №190,420.17. The mean number of extension visits per annum was one (1). The mean number of training attended per annum was two (2). The mean number of birds kept was 761 while the mean annual gross income of the respondents was \$1,002,208.55.

 Table 2. Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents (n=119)

| Tuble 2. Socio ccononne characteria       | sues of Respond  | ients (n=11)) |     |
|---|------------------|---------------|-----|
| Variables                                 | iables Frequency |               |     |
| Mean                                      |                  |               |     |
| Sex                                       |                  |               |     |
| Male                                      | 61               | 51.3          |     |
| Female                                    | 58               | 48.7          |     |
| Age (years)                               |                  |               |     |
| 1-20                                      | 1                | 0.84          |     |
| 21-40                                     | 50               | 42.02         |     |
| 41-60                                     | 62               | 52.10         |     |
| 43years                                   |                  |               |     |
| >60                                       | 6                | 5.0           |     |
| Level of education                        |                  |               |     |
| Nonformula education                      | 2                | 1.7           |     |
| Primary                                   | 29               | 24.4          |     |
| Secondary                                 | 70               | 58.8          |     |
| Tertiary                                  | 18               | 15.1          |     |
| Marital status                            |                  |               |     |
| Single                                    | 23               | 19.3          |     |
| Married                                   | 86               | 72.3          |     |
| Widower                                   | 10               | 8.4           |     |
| House hold size (persons)                 |                  |               |     |
| 1-5                                       | 72               | 60.5          |     |
| 6-10                                      | 47               | 39.5          | 5.0 |
| <b>Poultry Farming Experience (years)</b> |                  |               |     |
| 1-10                                      | 99               | 83.2          |     |
| 11-20                                     | 18               | 15.1          | 7.0 |
| >20                                       | 2                | 1.7           |     |
| Cooperative membership                    |                  |               |     |
| Yes                                       | 36               | 30.3          |     |
| No  | 83               | 69.7          |     |
| Amount of Credit Received per annum       | (naira)          |               |     |
| ₩1.000-200.000                            | 11               | 27.5          |     |
| ₩201,000-400,000                          | 16               | 40.0          |     |
| ₩190,420.17                               |                  |               |     |
| > <del>N</del> 401,000                    | 13               | 32.5          |     |

| No of extension visit (per annum) |    |      |                |
|-----------------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| 0                                 | 82 | 68.0 |                |
| 1-5                               | 17 | 31.1 |                |
| Number of Training Attended       |    |      |                |
| 1-5                               | 72 | 97.3 |                |
| 6-10                              | 2  | 2.7  | 1.85           |
| Farm Size (Number of birds)       |    |      |                |
| 1-500                             | 78 | 65.3 |                |
| 501-1000                          | 26 | 21.8 | 761            |
| Above 1000                        | 13 | 12.6 |                |
| Annual Income (naira              |    |      |                |
| ₩10000-500000                     | 68 | 57.1 |                |
| ₦5001-1,000,000                   | 37 | 31.1 |                |
| > <del>N</del> 1000,000           | 14 | 11.8 | ₦ 1,002,208.55 |

Source: Field survey, 2019

n=sample size

# Sources of information of the respondents on poultry production

The result in Table3 showed that the majority (68.9%) of the respondents sourced information on poultry production from fellow farmers. Saleh *et al.* (2016) reported that farmers used more non-professional

interpersonal sources of information such as friends/neighbours and other farmers than professional interpersonal sources of information. Agbamu (2006) noted that the sources of the information mostly used by developing countries are influenced by the farmer's age, level of education, available sources of modernization in the locality.

### Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to sources of information

| Sources                              | *Frequency | Percentage (%) | Rank             |
|--------------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Fellow poultry farmers               | 82         | 68.9           | $1^{st}$         |
| Radio                                | 68         | 57.1           | $2^{nd}$         |
| Personal observation                 | 67         | 56.3           | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| Veterinarians                        | 65         | 54.6           | $4^{\text{th}}$  |
| Family/Neighbors                     | 49         | 41.2           | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Television programme                 | 49         | 41.2           | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Internet                             | 46         | 38.7           | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Workshops                            | 42         | 35.3           | 7 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Poultry Product dealers              | 37         | 31.1           | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Research Institutes                  | 36         | 30.3           | 9 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Print media                          | 33         | 27.7           | 10 <sup>th</sup> |
| Poultry Association of Nigeria (PAN) | 25         | 21.0           | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| Extension workers                    | 18         | 15.1           | $12^{\text{th}}$ |
| Inputs dealers                       | 18         | 15.1           | 12 <sup>th</sup> |

Source: Field survey, 2019

\*Multiple responses allowed

### **Training Needs of the Respondents**

The result in Table 4 showed that poultry farmers in the study area needed training in the areas of selection of eggs for hatching( $\bar{x} = 1.2$ ), identification of fertile egg ( $\bar{x}=1.4$ ), Care and management of

hatching egg, Control of ectoparasite, Formulation of poultry ration and Compounding of feed using locally available ingredients ( $\bar{x}$ =1.5), De-beaking practice and Sexing of chicks ( $\bar{x}$ =1.6), Identification of poultry breeds ( $\bar{x}$ =1.7), Optimal feeding of beds ( $\bar{x}$ = 1.9). This type of result is expected since they were neither knowledgeable nor skilled in them. Training could also help them improve their capabilities, but more importantly, boost their morale and motivation that contributing to their positive performance level. This result corroborates Nwaobiala *et al.* (2018) who asserted that when farmers are given appropriate and required training on their farm business, it helps them acquire information and develop abilities and attitudes which will result in greater competence in the performance of their work and improve productivity.

| Poultry Management Practices                           | Level of competency (Mean) |
|--|----------------------------|
| Selection of eggs for hatching                         | 1.2*                       |
| Identification of fertile eggs                         | 1.4*                       |
| Care and management of hatching eggs                   | 1.5*                       |
| Control of ectoparasite                                | 1.5*                       |
| Formulation of poultry ration                          | 1.5*                       |
| Compounding of feed using locally available ingredient | 1.5*                       |
| De-beaking practice                                    | 1.6*                       |
| Sexing of chicks                                       | 1.6*                       |
| Identification of poultry breeds                       | 1.7*                       |
| Optimal feeding of bids                                | 1.9*                       |
| Feeds and feeding knowledge                            | 2.0                        |
| Poultry record keeping                                 | 2.0                        |
| Marketing of poultry products                          | 2.1                        |
| Disease prevention and control                         | 2.1                        |
| Deworming  | 2.1                        |
| Administration of vaccine                              | 2.1                        |
| Identification of sick birds                           | 2.2                        |
| Brooding of chicks                                     | 2.3                        |
| Care of poultry equipment                              | 2.3                        |

### Table 3 Distribution of Respondents according to Training Needs

Source: Field survey, 2019

\*Training needs

Note: Any mean score < 2.0 implies training needed while mean score  $\geq$  2.0 implies training not needed

### **Determinant of Training Needs**

Table 5 showed the result of the logit regression analysis on determinants of training needs of respondents. The result showed that the coefficient of determination R Square  $(R^2)$  value was 0.672. This indicates that the independent variables explain 67.2% of the variability of the The variable dependent variable. of education was positive and significant at 1% level of probability; age and number of training attended respectively were significant at 5%.

The level of education was positively significant at .000. This implies that an increase in the level of education of respondents will increase the probability of training needs of the farmers Education frees the farmer from ignorance and improves his knowledge and experience. The more educated farmers are the more they are likely to find solutions to their poultry farming business. Education will help poultry farmers to adopt improved poultry farming management practices thereby improving poultry product supply. The coefficient of age was significant at .042. This implies that as the respondents are advance in age there is

probability and likelihood they will be exposed to seminars, workshops and other training.

The variable for the number of training attended was positive and significant at .021. The result implies an increase in the number of training will increase the probability of attending more training by poultry farmers. The result implies that the number of training in poultry farming will have a positive impact on the poultry farmers' business. It could help them to adopt improved poultry business management practices thereby improving poultry product supply and ensuring food availability for men. This corroborates the work of Lanre (2016) in a study "Socio-economic characteristics of small scale poultry farmers in "Enugu State, Nigeria. The results of the correlation coefficient show that poultry farmers' training helped adopt improved poultry management practices thereby improving poultry meat supply and ensuring food security.

| Constant                    | В       | Std. Err. | Wald   | P-value |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Age                         | .086    | .042      | 4.143  | .042**  |
| Level of education          | .473    | .105      | 20.198 | .000*** |
| Farming experience          | .142    | .098      | 2.093  | .148    |
| Amount of credit received   | .000    | .000      | 3.226  | .072    |
| Extension visit             | .521    | .288      | 3.283  | .070    |
| Number of training attended | .168    | .073      | 5.303  | .021**  |
| Number of birds kept        | .000    | .000      | .765   | .382    |
| Constant                    | -11.069 | 2.540     | 18.988 | .000    |

Table 4 Determinants of Training Needs of Poultry Farmers in the Study Area

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Note: \*\*\*, \*\* variable is Significant at 1% and 5% respectively

 $\mathbf{R}^2 = 0672 \ (67.2\%)$ 

Dependent variable (Training need of poultry farmers).

#### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Poultry farmers in the study area lack the adequate training required to ensure efficient and profitable poultry production. Due to this conclusion; the study recommends that Extension efforts should be geared towards encouraging poultry farmers to sponsor training workshops and seminars by inviting the resource person to address their areas of poultry management training needs. Adequate, free and complete information on poultry training programs should be made available by the government to poultry farmers.

# References

- Adewole, G. (2017). Nigerian poultry industry is worth over 2.1tn.accessed from <u>https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.p</u> hp on 6/10/2020
- Agbamu J.U (2006). Essentials of Agricultural communication in Nigeria. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Arowolo, O. O., Ogunrombi, A. A., Akpantaku, S. O. and Adeogun, S. O. (2017). Perception of farm succession planning by poultry farmers in southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 21 (1), 83-98.
- Babalola, D. A. (2014). Determination of farmers' Adoption of Agricultural Insurance: The case of poultry farmers in Abeokuta metropolis of Ogun state, Nigerian. *British Journal of Poultry Science*, 3, 36-41.
- Babatunde, R. O, Adekunle & Olagunju, F. I (2012). Effect of poultry production on poverty status of small scale farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development 2: 565-578.
- Chukwu, A.O. (2013). "Farmers' perception of the effectiveness of extension principles in extension delivery in Owerri Agricultural Zone, Imo State, Nigeria". Inter. Journal of. Applied Research. and Technology. 2(3):38 – 43.
- Famuyiwa, B. S., Adesoji, S. A., and Lawal, J. O. (2012). Training needs of smallholder cocoa farmers in management integrated pest techniques: An antidote to sustainable cocoa production in Osun State, Nigeria. International Journal of Applied Research 1(3):37-46.
- Farayola. C. O., Adeyemo, A. A., Nwachukwu, S. C., and Yusuf, A. (2013). Extension strategy development and training needs for Small scale commercial poultry farmers in Nigeria. *Journal of World Poultry Research*, 3(4): 99-105.

- Federal Information Service Centre, FISC, (2016) Jos. <u>https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php</u> on 6/10/2020.
- Ibitoye, S. J and Onisimi, J. A. (2013). Influence of training on farmer's productivity in poultry production in Koji State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 12(4): 239-244.
- Imonikhe, G. A, (2010). Impact of Katsina State Agricultural Project (KSACAP) on Income and Productivity. International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, 1(3):115-124. Journal of World's Poultry Research. 3(4): 99-105.
- Lanre, J.L. (2016). Socio-economic characteristics of small scale poultry farmers in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Poultry farming and* vaccination 4(8):259-264.
- Moreki, J.C. and Keaikitse, T. (2013). "Poultry waste management practices in selected poultry operations around Gaborone, Botswana". *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2(7):240-248.
- NPC. (2006). National Population Commission.
- Nwaobiala, C.U., Nnamdi,U.S and Ekumankama, O.O. (2018).Performance analysis of National Directorate of Employment graduate poultry farmers in Imo State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology*,18(1):15-21.
- Ogunlade, I., Oduwaiye, M.O., Omotesho, K. F and Komolafe, S.E. (2017). Extension Information Needs of Commercial Poultry Farmers on Environmental Management in Kogi State, Nigeria. *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology*, 18(1):349-356.
- Okwoche, V.A., Abu, O., and Hon, F.A. (2015). Analysis of training needs of livestock farmers in Benue State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 3(2):55-60.

- Pandey R.K., (2015). A Critical Analysis on training needs of farmers about mustard production technology. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 7(14):892-895.
- Pindyck, R.S and Rubinfeld, D. L. (1981). Economic model and econometric forecast. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Saleh, J. M., Man., N., Salih, M. H., Hassan, S., Nawi, N. M., Mohammed, S. T. (2016). Training needs of agriculture extension officers in Iraq. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(2): 146-152.